SAMUEL G. HUNTINGTON

Sam G. Huntington

S. G. Huntington

A Gordon 1908

Servant H. M. J. 46 [illegible]
Payment — 63
[illegible] — 70
Argument — 74
de 94 95
Position & pr. [illegible] 110 [illegible]

A

TREATISE

ON THE

LAW OF EVIDENCE.

BY S. M. PHILLIPPS, ESQ.
OF THE INNER TEMPLE, BARRISTER AT LAW.

FIRST AMERICAN, FROM THE SECOND LONDON EDITION;

WITH NOTES AND REFERENCES TO AMERICAN AUTHORITIES.

BY JOHN A. DUNLAP,
COUNSELLOR AT LAW.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,

THE THEORY OF

PRESUMPTIVE PROOF, &c.

NEW-YORK:

PUBLISHED BY GOULD, BANKS, & GOULD, AND BY W. GOULD & CO.
ALBANY.

G. F. HOPKINS, PRINTER.

.....

1816.

mg 19447

Southern District of New-York, ss.

BE IT REMEMBERED, that on the eighteenth day of July, in the forty-first year of the Independence of the United States of America, Gould, Banks, and Gould, of the said District, have deposited in this office the Title of a Book, the right whereof they claim as proprietors, in the words following, to wit:

L. S.

" A Treatise on the Law of Evidence. By S. M. Phillipps, Esq. of the Inner Temple, Barrister at Law. First American, from the second London edition; with Notes and References to American Authorities. By John A. Dunlap, Counsellor at Law. To which is added, The Theory of Presumptive Proof, &c."

In conformity to the Act of the Congress of the United States, entitled " An Act for the encouragement of Learning, by securing the copies of Maps, Charts, and Books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the time therein mentioned." And also to an Act, entitled " An Act supplementary to an Act, entitled an act for the encouragement of Learning, by securing the copies of Maps, Charts, and Books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned, and extending the benefits thereof to the arts of designing, engraving, and etching historical and other prints."

THERON RUDD,
Clerk of the Southern District of New-York.

ADVERTISEMENT.

Several additions and alterations have been made in the present edition of the following Treatise. Some parts of the work, which appeared to be treated in too concise a manner, have been enlarged, and the whole has been carefully revised. In consequence of the length of time, which the former edition took in passing through the press, many cases had been reported before its publication, which it was not possible to introduce; these, and the other cases upon the subject down to the present period, are now inserted.

Middle Temple,
May 19, 1815.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
The Institute of Museum and Library Services through an Indiana State Library LSTA Grant

http://www.archive.org/details/treatiseonlawofe00phil

ADVERTISEMENT

OF THE AMERICAN EDITOR.

The design of the editor was, principally, to collect the decisions of the different courts in the United States, connected with the subject of the following work, the undoubted merit of which, justly entitles it to a preference to all former treatises on the law of evidence. The exuberance of the subject itself, and a solicitude to insert every thing which could be deemed useful, have swelled the notes greatly beyond what was originally expected and intended: and yet the learned reader will perceive that they might have been made still more extensive; that much has been omitted by design, and much, no doubt, through inadvertence. All the American works of celebrity and merit have been carefully consulted, and though some others, of a contrary description, have been entirely neglected, yet it may not be improper to apologize for a number of references to loose and obscure reporters. A few additional English authorities have been collected, and in two or three instances it has been attempted to supply, however imperfectly, some omissions of the author—omissions arising not from ignorance or carelessness, but from his desire to compress the work; and it is not unlikely that,

upon careful examination, what might at first sight have appeared an omission, would be found to be no other than a necessary deduction from some principle which had been before fully stated. The editor submits his labours, such as they are, to the candour of the profession, and if they should be thought undeserving of approbation, he has at least this consolation, that they cannot detract from the merit of the original work.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

CHAP. I.

	Page
Of the Attendance of Witnesses - -	2
Attendance in Civil Cases - -	2
Writ of Subpœna ad Testificandum -	2
Tender of Expenses - - -	3
Expenses of Witness abroad - -	3
Service of Subpœna - -	4
Remedies for Non-attendance - -	4
Privilege from Arrest - - -	5
Attendance before Commissioners of Bankrupt - - -	6
Attendance before Commissioners of Inclosure - - -	7
Attendance in Criminal Cases - -	7
Compensation for attendance - -	8
Writ of Habeas Corpus ad Testificandum	9
Examination of Witness abroad -	10
Subpœna duces tecum - -	11

CHAP. II.

Of the Incompetency of Witness from Want of Understanding - - - - - -	13
Persons insane, Lunatics, &c. -	14
Children - - - -	14

CHAP. III.

Of the Incompetency of Witnesses from Defect of Religious Principle - - - - -	16
The General Rule - - -	16
Atheists - - - -	17
Persons professing other Religions -	17
Excommunication - - -	18
Form of administering the Oath -	19
Affirmation of Quakers - -	20

CHAP. IV.

Of the Incompetency of Witnesses from Infamy of Character - - - - -	22

Sect. 1. Of the Offences, which incapacitate - 22
Treason, Felony, Crimen falsi, &c. - 22
Proof of Judgment necessary - 24
Competency of Witness how restored - 24
Purgation - - - 24
Burning in the Hand - 25
Privilege of Clergy - - 26
Pardon - - - 27
Sect. 2. Of the Admissibility of Accomplices - 28
General Rule - - - 28
Approvement - - - 29
Competency of Accomplices - - 31
Confirmatory Evidence - - 32
Witness invalidating his own Written Instrument - - - 33

CHAP. V.

Of the Incompetency of Witness from Interest - 34
Sect. 1. Of the nature of the Interest, which disqualifies - - - - - - - 36
The General Rule - - - 36
Expectation of Benefit—Bias from Similarity of Situation, &c. - - - 37
Witness acting under bare Authority—believing himself interested - - 40. 41
Persons, for whom or against whom the Verdict would be Evidence—gaining or losing directly by the Verdict - 43—52
Examples——Commoners - - 44
Persons liable to Costs - 46
Tenant in Possession - 48
Devisee under the same Will 51
Bankrupt - - 51
Creditor of Bankrupt - 51
Degree of Interest - - - 52
Witness interested on both Sides - 53
Sect. 2. Of the Rule on the Subject of Interest, considered with reference to the Parties in the Suit - - - - 57
General Rule, and Examples - - 57
Exceptions - - - 57. 58
Freemen of Corporations - - 59
Plaintiff Witness against Co-plaintiff - 60
Defendant when and how made Witness - 61
Sect. 3. Of the Rule on the Subject of Interest, considered with reference to the Husband or Wife of the Party - - - 63
Reason of the Rule - - 63
Examples - - - 64—67
Exceptions - - 67—71

Page

Sect. 4. Of the Effect of Admissions by a Party to the Suit, or by his Agent, against the Party's Interest 71
Admission by the Party - - 72
Admission by one jointly interested - 73
Statement by Agent of Party - 74—78
Effect of admissions - - 78—80

Sect. 5. Of the Admissibility of the Confession of a Prisoner against himself - - - - 81
General Rule - - - 81
What Confessions—how taken—how given in Evidence - - - 82—84
In Cases of High Treason - 84—86

Sect. 6. Of the Admissibility of the Party injured, as Witness in Criminal Prosecutions - - 86
General Rule, and Examples - 86—88
Exception in the Case of Forgery 88—91

Sect. 7. Of certain Exceptions to the general Rule on the Subject of Interest - - - 91
Informers - - - - 92
Inhabitants of Counties, Parishes, &c. 93
Persons entitled to Rewards - - 94
Agents, Factors, Servants, &c. - 94

Sect. 8. Of the Means by which the Competency of a Witness may be restored - - - 96
Release, Payment, &c. - - 97
Member of Corporation - - 98
Release in certain Cases unnecessary 99—102
1. Where the witness offers to release 99
2. Where he acquires the Interest, to deprive the Party of his Testimony 99—102
3. Where the Witness is answerable to one or other of the Parties - 102

CHAP. VI.

Of the Admissibility of Counsel or Solicitor - 102
The General Rule - - 102
Privilege of Client in what Cases - 103
Interpreter between Counsel and Client 103
Confidential Communications - 104
What Facts the Solicitor, &c. may prove 105

CHAP. VII.

Of certain General Rules of Evidence - - 106

Sect. 1. As to the Number of Witnesses, for the Proof of a Fact - - - - 107
In case of Perjury - - 107
In Trial for Treason - - 108
In Courts of Equity - - 110
In Ecclesiastical Courts - - 110

Page

Sect. 2. Of the Nature of Presumptive Evidence - 111
Pr. Evid. of Legitimacy - 112
——— of Payment - - 113
——— of Payment of Bond 114—118
——— of Property - - 118
——— of Grants, &c. - 119—124
——— in Criminal Cases 124—126
Sect. 3. Evidence is to be confined to the Points in Issue - - - - 126
Evidence on Non-assumpsit - 126—128
——— on non est Factum - 128
——— on not guilty in Trespass 129
——— on Issue on Custom - 130—133
Proof of *other* Acts when Admissible 133—135
The Rule in Criminal Cases - 135—139
Evidence of Character - - 139
Admissions on Record - - 141
Judgment by Default - - 141
Payment of Money into Court 142—145
Bill of Particulars - - 145—150
Sect. 4. The Affirmative of the Issue is to be proved 150
General Rule - - - 150
Exceptions, where Breach of Duty charged 151
Other Exceptions - - 151—153
Sect. 5. The Substance only of the Issue need be proved - - - - 153
Examples - - - 153—158
Averments when immaterial - 158—160
Variance in Proof of *Contract* 160—162
Variance in Proof of *Deed* - 162
Variance in Proof of *Record* 162—164
Variance in *Time* - - 164
Variance in *Place* - - 165
Sect. 6. That the best Evidence is to be produced, which the Nature of the Case admits - 167
The Meaning and Extent of the Rule 167—170
Cases, where the best Evidence is dispensed with - - 170—173
Sect. 7. Hearsay is not Evidence - - 173
General Rule - - - 173
Exceptions - - - 174
on Question of Pedigree - 174—180
as to *Time* of Birth - - 180
as to *Place* of Birth, &c. - 180
on Questions of Custom, Tolls, &c. 182—184
Rector's Books, old Leases, &c. 184—189
Hearsay, as to *Public* Rights - 189
Hearsay, as to *Private* Rights 189—191

Page
Declarations against Interest 191—195
Tradesman's books - 195—199
Testimony of deceased Witness on former Trial - - 199
Dying Declarations - 200—202
Hearsay, Part of res gesta 202—204

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Examination of Witnesses - - - 204
Proper Time of objecting to Competency - - - - 204
Leading Questions - - 205
Privilege of Witness in not answering 206—209
Memorandum, to assist Witness - 209
Opinion of Witness - - 209
Rule as to Cross-examination - 210—212
Credit of Witness how attacked 212—214

CHAP. IX.

Of Bills of Exceptions, and Demurrers to Evidence 214
Bill of Exceptions - - 214
Demurrer to Evidence - 215—217

PART THE SECOND.

CHAP. I.

Of Acts of Parliament - - - 218
Records not to be contradicted - 218
General Acts - - - 219
Private Acts - - - 219
Acts, when to be pleaded - - 220

CHAP. II.

Of Verdicts, and Judgments of Courts of Record - 222
Sect. 1. Of Verdicts and Judgments, considered with reference to the Parties in the Suit - 222
Rule, as between the *same Parties* 223—226
Rule as between *Privies* - 226—228
Rule with respect to *Strangers* 228—233
Exceptions to the Rule - - 233
Sect. 2. Of Verdicts and Judgments, considered with reference to the Subject-matter of the Suit 234—237
Sect. 3. Of the Admissibility, in Civil Cases, of Verdicts in Criminal Proceedings - 237—242

Page

CHAP. III.

Of the Judgments of Courts of exclusive Jurisdiction 242
Sect. 1. Of Sentences in the Ecclesiastical Courts 243
Sentence on Question of Marriage 243
Sentence of Jactitation - - 244
Probate and Letters of Administration 245
Sentence how far Evidence in Criminal Proceedings - - - 246
Sentence impeachable for fraud - 247
Sect. 2. Of Sentences in Courts of Admiralty and Foreign Courts - - - - - 248
Sentence of Courts of Admiralty on Question of Prize - - - 248
Sentence of Foreign Courts of Admiralty 249—251
Sentence of other Foreign Courts - 252
Sect. 3. Of Judgments in rem in the Exchequer, and by Commissioners of Excise - 254
Judgment of Condemnation in Exchequer - - - 254
Judgment by Commissioners of Excise 254—258
Acquittal in the Exchequer - 258
Sect. 4. Of Sentences by Members of a College, and Convictions before Magistrates - 259
Sentence of Expulsion by a College 259
Conviction by Magistrate - 260
General Rule, as to limited Jurisdictions 261

CHAP. IV.

Of certain other Judicial Proceedings - . 262
Sect. 1. Of Proceedings in Chancery - - 262
Decree - - - 262
Bill - - - - 263
Answer - - 264—267
Depositions - - 267—272
Sect. 2. Of Depositions, Examinations, Inquisitions, &c. - - - - 272
Depositions by Consent - - 272
Depositions in India - - 273
Depositions and Proceedings before Commissioners of Bankrupt - 273—276
Depositions before Magistrates 276—279
Depositions before Coroner 279—281
Inquisitions - - 281—283
Examinations - - 283—286
Depositions in Ecclesiastical Courts 286
Judgments of Inferior Courts - 287
Awards - - - 288

Page

CHAP. V.

Of the Proof of Records, and Judicial Proceedings 288
Acts of Parliament - - 288
Records of Courts, and Copies of 289—293
Verdicts - - - 293
Writs - - - - 293
Common Recoveries - - 295
Proceedings in Chancery - - 295
Decree - - - 295
Answer - - 296
Depositions - - 297
Judgment in House of Lords - 298
Proceedings in inferior Courts - 298
Probate of Wills - - 298—300
Letters of Administration - - 300
Foreign Judgment - - 301
Award - - - - 301

CHAP. VI.

Of Public Writings, not judicial - - - 302
Doomsday-book - - 302
Ecclesiastical Surveys - 303—305
Journals of Parliament - - 305
Gazettes - - - 305
Parish Registers - - - 306
Register of Ships - 308—311
Rate-books - - - 311
Book for Parish-indentures - 312
Books of Public offices - 312—315
Rolls of Manor Courts - - 315
Terriers - - - - 316—318
Herald's Books - - 318
Corporation-books - - 619
Histories - - - - 320
Proof of Entry in Public Books - 320

CHAP. VII.

Of the Inspection of Public Writings - - 322
Records - - - 322
Copy of Indictment - 322—324
Inspection of Depositions in Criminal Cases - - - 324
Proceedings of Inferior Jurisdictions 325—328
Books of Public Offices - - 328
Court Rolls - - - 329
Corporation-books - - 330
Rule of Court for Inspection 332—334
Mandamus - - - 334

Page

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Proof of Private Writings - - 335
Sect. 1. Of the Proof of Deeds - - 335
Subpœna duces tecum - - 335
Notice to Produce - 336—342
Proof of Notice - - 342
Proof of Deed produced under Notice 343—346
Secondary Evidence of the Contents when admissible - - 346—349
General Rule as to Proof of Execution 349—356
Exceptions.—1. Deed 30 Years old 349—352
2. Deeds enrolled 352—356
3. Deed recited - 356
4. Deed under Rule of Court 356
Proof of Execution, by subscribing Witness - - - 356—358
Signing - - 358—360
Sealing - - 360
Delivery - - 361
Proof of Party's Hand-writing, when sufficient Proof of Execution 362—364
Proof of Hand-writing in general 364—372
Comparison of Hand-writing - 372—374
Sect. 2. Of the Proof of Wills - - 374
Forms required by Stat. of Frauds 374—377
Proof of Contents of Will - 377
Proof of Execution, by subscribing Witness - - - 378
Signing - - 379
Attestation - 380—383
Proof, where subscribing Witness cannot be produced, &c. - 383—385

CHAP. IX.

Of stamping, as a Requisite of Written Instruments 386
General Rule - - - 386
Cases, where the Fact admits of other Proof - - - 386
Writing made in Foreign Country - 387
Denomination of Stamp - - 388
Several Stamps, where necessary 389—393
Alteration of stamped Instrument 393—398
Unstamped Instrument, when Evidence for collateral Purposes - 398—403
Writing lost, Stamp presumed - 403
Defect of Stamp, how cured - 404
Stamp on Agreements - - 405
Exemptions - 406—409

Page

CHAP. X.

Of the Admissibility of Parol Evidence to explain, vary, or discharge Written Instruments - - - 410
Sect. 1. Of the Admissibility of Parol Evidence to explain Ambiguities - - 410
Latent Ambiguity - - 410—416
Patent Ambiguity - - 416—419
Usage explanatory of ancient Charters and Deeds - - 419—423
Sect. 2. Of the Admissibility of Parol Evidence to vary or discharge Written Instruments - 423
Wills - - - 423
Deeds - - 424—432
Proof of another Consideration 424—427
In case of Illegal Transaction - 427
Proof of a different Time of Delivery 428
Proof of Customary Right, &c. not expressed in Lease - 429—432
Mercantile Contracts - - 432
Policies of Insurance - - 432
Charter-parties - - 433
Promissory Notes, &c. - 433
Evidence of Usage as explanatory 434—437
Agreements within Stat. of Frauds 437—441
Agreements not within Stat. of Frauds 441
Discharge of Simple Contract by Parol 444—448
Sect. 3. Of the Rule in Courts of Equity, respecting the Admissibility of Parol Evidence - 448
General Rule - - - 448
Rule with respect to the *Defendant*, on a Bill for specific Performance 449—451
Rule with respect to the *Plaintiff* 451—458
Mistakes in Deeds, &c. when rectified 458—460
Trusts in Equity, when raised by Parol Evidence 460

TABLE

OF

THE CASES CITED.

A

Page

ABBOT v. Massie 418
——— v. Smith 127. 162
Abbot v. Plumb 357. 363
Abery v. Dickenson 326. 328
Abrahams q. t. v. Bunn 39. 90
Ackerley v. Dr. Parkinson 262
Ackland v. Pearce 343
Adam v. Kerr 361. 362. 363
Adams v. Davis 95
Addington v. Clode 330
Addy v. Grix 381
Akehurst's case 98
Alban v. Pritchett 64. 69
Alcorn v. Westbrook 154
Alexander v. Gibson 75. 214
Allen's case 293
Allen v. Dundas 246
Altham (Lord) v. Anglesey (Earl) 268
Altham's case 411
Alves v. Hodgson 386. 387
Ames v. Hill 406
Amey v. Long 12. 336
Amitie, Villeneuve, case of 43
Anderson v. May 343
——— v. Pitcher 434
Andrews v. Palsgrave 143
Annandale (Marchioness) v. Harris 356
——— v. Browne 270

Page

Anscomb v. Shore 44
Anstey v. Dowsing 97. 99. 376 378
Antram v. Chase 302
Arding v. Flower 6
Argent v. Durant 129
Armorie v. Delamirie 118
Armstrong and Lisle 26
Aslin v Parkin 224. 236
Atcheson v. Everett 21
Atherfold v. Beard 329
Athol's (Duke of) case 234
Atkins v. Hatton 316
Attorney-General v. Bowman 139
——— v. Coventry (City) 330
——— v. Foster 421
——— v. Griffith 19
——— v. Le Merchant 12. 338
——— v. Parker 421
Atwood's case 28. 32
Audley (Lord)'s case 68
Austin v. Willes 385
Aveson v. Lord Kinnaird 181 201. 203
Azyre's case 68

B

	Page
Backhouse v. Middleton	269
Bacon's case	88
Badkin v. Chancillor	130
Baggalley v. Jones	193
Bagshaw v. Bp. of Bangor	304
Bailey v. Wilson	40
Baker v. Ld. Fairfax	268
—— v. Jardine	390
—— v. Morley	64
—— v. Paine	459
—— v. Sweet	297
Baker's case	216
Ball v. Dunsterville	361
—— v. Bostock	47
Ballard v. Dyson	123
Bambridge's case	200
Banbury Peerage, case of,	178 263
Barber v. Holmes	312
Baring v. Royal Ex. Ass. Comp.	250
—— v. Clagett 249. 250.	251
Barker v. Sir Woolston Dixie	66
—— v. Macrae	95
Barlow v. Vowel	99
Barnstaple (Corpor.) v. Lathey	331. 332
Barrett v. Gore	63
Barrow v. Greenough	460
Barry v. Alexander	337
—— v. Bebbington	192
—— v. Nugent	407
Barrymore (Ld.) v. Taylor	79
Barstow v. Kilvington	459
Barnes v. Mawson	190
Bartlet v. Pickersgill	87. 88. 241
Barzillay v. Lewis	250
Bateman v. Bailey	202
—— v. Philips	346. 441
Bath v. Montague	31. 37
Bath (Earl) v. Battersea	264
Bathe v. Taylor	394
Batty v. Gresley	6
Bauerman v. Radenius	57. 72 75
Baxter v. Brown	407
Baylis v. Attorney-General	418
Baynham v. Guy's Hospital	423
Bealey v. Shaw	122
Beasley v. Magrath	266
Beaumont v. Fell	411
Bedell's case	424
Bedle v. Beard	119
Beebee v. Parker	182
Bell v. Harwood	54
—— v. Howard	447
Benjamin v. Porteus	94
Bennet v. Hertford (Hundred of)	58
Bennett v. Francis	143
—— v. Neale	120
Benson v. Olive	267
Bent v. Baker	37. 49. 100
Bentley v. Cook	64
Berkeley Peerage, case of	178. 264. 269
Bernard (Ld.) v. Saul	221
Bernardi v. Motteux	249. 250
Berry v. Banner	233
Berryman v. Wise	170. 172
Bertie v. Ld. Falkland	423
Bettison v. Bromley	40. 377
Berwick's case	85
Bevan q. t. v. Williams	171
Bevis v. Lindfell	141
Biddulph v. Ather	234
—— v. St. John	110
Biggs v. Laurence	75
Billers v. Bowles	141
Bilmore, case of	31
Binsted v. Coleman	437
Bird v. Appleton	251
—— v. Randall	224
Birt v. Kirshaw	55
Bishops (the Seven) trial of	370
Blackham's case	245
Blake v. Lawrence	147
Blake's case	444
Blakey v. Porter	336. 346
Bland v. Ansley	52. 65
Blandford v. Detastet	5
Bluet q. t. v. Needs	150
Blundell v. Howard	132

Page
Blurton v. Toon 363
Bolton v. Carlisle (Bp.) 348
Bolton v. Gladstone 249. 250. 251
Bond v. Seawell 332
Borthwick v. Carruthers 153
Boson v. Sandford 162
Botham v. Swingler 97
Bounty, Mutineers' case of 61
Bourne v. Turner 48
Bowditch v. Mawley 162
Bowen v. Ashley 390
Bowerman v. Sybourn 263
Bowles v. Johnson 3
——— v. Longworthy 357
Bowman v. Nichol 394
Bowsher v. Cally 76
Boyle v. Boyle 240
Bradbury v. Grinsel 123
Braddick v. Thompson 444
Bradwin v. Harpur 411
Brangham's case 322
Brazier's case 15. 203
Breedon v. Gill 286
Breton v. Cope 312. 321. 357
Brett v. Rigden 423
Brewer v. Palmer 386
Brice v. Smith 381. 383
Bridgman v. Jennings 182 188
Bristow v. Wright 158. 160
Brock v. Kent 77
Brodie v. St. Paul 448
——— v. Tickel 5
Bromley v. Wallace 140
Bromwich's case 277. 280
Brook v. Willett 156
Brookbard v. Woodley 371. 373
Broughton v. Harper 66
Brounker (Ld.) v. Atkins 227. 320
Brown v. Brown 62
——— v. Bullen 276
——— v. Crashaw 27
——— v. Fox 62
——— v. Franklyn 248
——— v. Jacobs 162
——— v. Corporation of London 99
——— v. M'Kinally 225

Page
Brown v. Sauce 160
——— v. Selwyn 424
——— v. Watts 146. 386
——— ats. ——— 270
Brównsword v. Edwards 237
Bruin (Sir J.)'s case 432
Brune v. Rawlins 273
Buckhouse and Crosby's case 446
Buckland v. Tankard 55
Buckler v. Millerd 424. 427
Buckworth's case 199
Bunting's case 243
Burbage's case 10
Burdon v. Browning 241
Burleigh v. Stibbs 79. 340
Burnet v. Taylor 362
Burridge's case 26. 28
Burrough v. Martin 209
Burrows v. Jemino 252
——— v. Lock 363. 364
Burt v. Palmer 77
——— v. Barlow 459
Burton v. Hinde 53. 59
Bush v. Rawling 31. 92
Butcher and Aldworth's case 290
———'s Comp. v. Jones 97
Buxton v. Bedall 403
Byne (ex parte) 6

C

Cabell v. Vaughan 128
Caffy's case 88
Call v. Dunning 357
Calliard v. Vaughan 11
Calthorpe v. Gough 385
Calvert v. Canterbury (Archbp.) 195. 198
Calvert v. Roberts 394
Campbell v. Wilson 121
——— v. Twemlow 70. 287
Cambridge v. Rous 424
Camden v. Anderson 308
Cardwell v. Martin 394
Carey v. Askew 375
Carlisle v. Trears 160
Carpenters' Comp., case of 40
Carr v. Heaton 121. 227

Page
Carr v. Hood 135
Carrington (Ld.) v. Payne 384
Cass's case 81
Casson v. Dade 383
Castil v. Bainbridge 21
Castlemain (Ld.)'s case 25. 27
Castledon v. Turner 417. 418
Cater v. Price 382
Cates q. tam v. Winter 12. 338
Cazenove v. Vaughan 272. 297
Celier's case 25
Chamberlain v. Porter 388
Champian v. Atkinson 95. 130
Chapman v. Cowlan 194. 316
——— v. Gardner 51
——— v. Graves 32. 62
——— v. Poynton 3
——— v. Smith 182
Charlesworth's case 23
Chater v. Hawkins 24
Chaurand v. Angerstein 209
Chelsea Waterworks (Gov. of) v. Cowper 349
Cheney's case 411. 423
Christie v. Secretan 249. 250
Clancey's case 23
Clanricard (Ld.) v. Ly. Denton 45
Clanricard (Ld.)'s case 319
Clarke v. Grant 450
——— v. Gray 144. 161
——— v. Shee 96
Clarkson v. Hanway 427
——— v. Woodhouse 187
Clay v. Willan 145
Clegg v. Levy 387
Clerk v. Bedford 197
Clifford v. Taylor 337
Clinan v. Cooke 443. 450. 454. 457
Clothier v. Chapman 190
Clowes v. Higginson 438
Clutterbuck v. Ld. Huntingtower 57
Cobb v. Carr 59
Cobden v. Kendrick 106
Cockman v. Mather 320
Coglan v. Williamson 362
Cohen v. Hannam 160

Page
Coke v. Fountain 268
Coker v. Farewell 199. 267
Colchester, Mayor, &c. case of 99
Cole v. Parkin 397
Collins v. Blantern 427
Collinson v. Hillear 275
Colsel v. Budd 114
Colson v. Selby 147
Compagnion v. Martin 155
Coney v. Verden 156
Cook v. Parsons 381
Cooke's case 206. 207
——— v. Booth 423
——— v. Munstone 160
——— v. Sholl 258
——— v. Stocks 346
Cooper v. Gibbons 338
——— v. Marsden 196. 197
——— v. South 309
Coore v. Clare 407
Cope v. Bedford 319
Copley (Sir J.) v. Day 392
Corbett v. Corbett 270. 298
Cording v. Drakeford 388
Corking v. Jarrard 96
Cort v. Birkbeck 233
Cotton v. Witt 3
Courteen v. Touse 206
Cox v. Copping 329
Cox v. Parry 142
Crawley v. Blewett 15
Craythorne v. Swinburne 425
Crepps v. Durden 260
Cresby's (Sir P.) case 31
Crew q. t. v. Blackburn 329
——— v. Saunders 334
Crimes v. Smyth 119
Crocker's case 88
Croft v. Pawlet 383
Cromwell (Ld.)'s case 424
Crosby's case 24. 27. 28
——— v. Percy 362. 363
——— v. Wadsworth 408
Cross v. Fox 51
——— v. Kaye 172
Cuddington v. Wilkins 27
Cuff v. Penn 439
Cunliffe v. Sefton 362
Curry v. Edensor 407

Page
Cuts v. Pickering 103. 105
Cutter v. Powell 436

D

Da Costa v. Villa Real 243
Dallison v. Starke 169
Daniel v. North 124
Daniell v. Pitt 77
Dartmouth (Lady) v. Roberts 266. 296
Darwin v. Upton 120. 121
Davies v. Pearce 182. 188
Davies's case 400
Davis and Carter's case 23
—— v. Denwoody 65
—— v. Williams 301. 391
Davy v. Smith 383
Day v. Bower 148
Deakin's case 118
De Gaillon v. L'Aigle 142
De la Motte's case 339. 366
Denn dem. Goodwin v. Spray 182. 315
De Sailly v. Morgan 212
Dickinson v. Shee 211
Dickson v. Fisher 219
——— v. Evans 151
Didsbury v. Thomas 190
Diersley's case 129
Dike v. Polhill 246
Dingler's case 200
D'Israeli v. Jowett 312
Dixon v. Cooper 94
Dodd (Dr.)'s case 98
Doe v. Burt 417
—— v. Pearson 109
—— v. Perkins 209
—— v. Spence 430
—— v. Watkins 430
Doe *ex dem.* Allason v. Sisson 182
——— Ash v. Calvert 246
——— Baggalley v. Jones 194
——— Banning v. Griffin 175
——— Brown v. Brown 413

Page
Doe *ex dem.* Chichester (Sir A.) v. Oxenden 413
——— Churchwardens of Croydon v. Cook 321
——— Clarges v. Forster 80
——— Cook v. Danvers 375. 411
——— Copley (Sir Joseph) v. Davy 392
——— Dagget v. Snowden 430
——— Foley v. Wilson 121
——— Forster v. Williams 48
——— Foster v. Sisson 130
——— George v. Jesson 152
——— Haldane and Urry v. Harvey 341
——— Hanson v. Fyldes 418
——— Heapy v. Howard 430
——— Jackson v. Ashburner 407
——— Johnson v. Ld. Pembroke 176
——— Jones v. Wilde 52
——— Jupp v. Andrews 105
——— Mansfield v. Peach 359
——— Mawson v. Liston 275
——— Morris v. Rosser 287
——— Reece v. Robson 192. 193
——— St. John v. Hoare 386
——— Spicer v. Lea 431
——— Strickland v. Spence 430
——— Sykes v. Durnford 357

Page
Doe *ex dem.* Tollet v. Salter 165
——— Walker v. Stephenson 213
——— Webber v. Lord G. Thynne 195
——— Wood v. Morris 165
——— Wright v. Manifold 383
Doncaster (Mayor of) v. Day 199
Dongal v. Wilson 120
Dormer v. Fortescue 62
Dover v. Maestaer 399
Downes v. Moreman 321
——— v. Skrymsher 165
Dowset v. Sweet 411
Drake v. Munday 406
Drummond's case 201
Du Barre v. Livette 103
Duberley v. Gunning 140
Duffin v. Smith 105
Duncan v. Scott 292
Dundass v. Lord Weymouth 162
Durham's case 32
Durham (Bp.) v. Beaumont 213
Durston v. Tuthan 160
Dutton v. Colt 20. 270
Dymoke and Others, case of 61

E

Eagleton and Coventry v. Kingston 365
East India Company v. Donald 110
——— v. Glover 142
Eaton v. Lyon 423
Eccleston v. Petty 266
Eden (Sir J.) v. Earl of Bute 417
Edwards v. Crock 65
——— v. Vesey 326
Egerton v. Matthews 441
Elden v. Keddell 301
Eldridge v. Knott 118
Ellis v. Shirley 275
——— v. Smith 379. 381
——— v. Wall 141
Elsam v. Fawcett 140
Elsom v. Brailey 51
Ely (Dean and Ch. of) v. Warren 131
Emerson v. Blonden 69
Emmerson v. Heelis 408
Ennis v. Donisthorn 200
Evans v. Lewis 127. 162
——— and Lake, case of 196
——— v. Philips 324
——— v. Williams 53. 102
Evelyn (Sir F.) v. Haynes 236
Ewens v. Gold 51. 98. 202
Exeter (Mayor of) v. Colman 332

F

Fabrigas v. Mostyn 77
Fachina v. Sabine 18. 20
Fairlie v. Hastings 74. 75. 78
Falconer v. Hanson 272
Farr v. Price 386. 389
Fasset v. Brown 363
Fate v. Humphrey 134
Faulder v. Silk 282
Fell v. Chamberlain 448
Fenn dem. Pewtriss and another v. Granger 60
Fermor's case 242
Ferrer's case 234. 237
Ferrers (Ld.) v. Shirley 263. 367
Field v. Curtis 51. 98
Filmer v. Gott 427
Finnerty v. Tipper 135
Fisher v. Kitchingham 293
——— v. Lane 298
Fitzgerald v. Eustace 356
——— v. Elsee 363
Fladoyen (case of) 251
Flemming and Windham's case 277. 278
Flower v. Herbert 51
——— v. Young 311
Floyd v. Bethill 432

Page
Folkard v. Hemet 330
Foles v. Chad 210
Fonsick v. Agar 273
Forbes v. Wall 349
Ford v. Grey 356
—— v. Guy 270
Forley dem. the Mayor of Canterbury v. Wood 431
Forrester v. Pigou 49. 101
Fotheringham v. Greenwood 40. 41. 49
Fountain v. Young 103
Foxcraft v. Lister 458
Francia's Case 84. 365
Francisco v. Gilmore 273
Franklin's Case 305
Fraser v. Hopkins 309
French q. t. v. Coxon 221
Frontine v. Frost 150
Fry v. Wood 267. 349
Fuller v. Fotch 257
—— v. Prentice 3. 5
Furneaux v. Hutchins 130. 131
Furly v. Newnham 10. 11

G

Gahagan's case 109
Gainsford v. Grammar 77. 104
Galbraith v. Neville 253
Gape v. Handley 420
Gardiner v. Jadis 140
Garnons v. Swift 167. 399
Garret v. Lister 301
Gaul's case 221
Geery v. Hopkins 328
Germain v. Frederick 127. 162
Geyer v. Aguilear 254
Gibson and Johnson v. Hunter 215. 217
—— v. Maccarty 238
Gladstone v. Neale 161
Glyn v. Bank of England 116. 189. 197. 268
Goater v. Nunnely 337
Goddard's case 428
Godfrey v. Norris 362
—— v. Macauley 306
Gold v. Jones 369
Goldschmidt v. Marryat 337
Goman v. Salisbury 446
Goodier v. Lake 348
Goodright dem. Farr v. Hicks 139
—— dem. Thompson v. Saul 112
—— dem. Stevens v. Moss 177
Goodtitle v. Braham 210
—— dem. Bremridge v. Walter 165. 166
—— dem. Fowler v. Welford 40. 99
—— dem. Pinsent v. Lammiman 165
—— dem. Radford v. Southern 412
Goodwin v. West 4
Gordon v. Austin 160
Gordon's case 157
Gordon v. Secretan 344
Gordons, case of the 170
Gorham v. Thompson 306
Goss v. Tracy 40. 44. 208. 362
Gottlieb v. Danvers 342
Gracewood v. —— 339
Grafton (Duchess) v. Holt 214
Graham v. Hope 306
—— v. Peate 118
—— v. Robertson 162
Grant v. Jackson 73. 267
Grant's case 84
Gray v. Cookson and Clayton 261
Grayson v. Atkinson 379. 381. 384
Greaves v. Ashlin 442
Green v. Dunn 80
—— v. Gaturck 199
—— v. Hearne 141
—— v. Hewitt 282
—— v. Jones 52
—— v. New River Company 46. 96. 228
—— v. Rennett 162
Gregory v. Parker 69
—— v. Fraser 400
Greg's case 85

Page
Grellier v. Neale 362. 368. 364
Grey v. Smith 405
Griffin v. Blanford 156
Griffith v. Matthews 120
Grigg (Mary)'s case 66. 68
Grimwood v. Barritt 163
Groenvelt (Dr.) v. Dr. Burwell 262. 322. 326. 334
Guest v. Caumont 166
Guilliam v. Hardy 290
Gully's case 28
Gunhis v. Erhart 438
Gunston and Downes 31. 37
Gutteridge v. Smith 143
Gyfford v. Woodgate 295
Gwinnet v. Philips 163
Gyles v. Hill 291

H

Haddow v. Parry 192
Hagedorn v. Reid 195
Halifax (Lord)'s case 151
Hall v. Cazenove 429
—— v. Hill 64
—— v. Smith 155
Hammond v. Stewart 4
Hampshire v. Pearce 415
Hands v. James 383
Hanson v. Parker 72
Hardcastle v. Sclater 283
Hare v. Shearwood 448
Harpur v. Brook 192
Harris v. Lincoln (Bp.) 411. 417
—— v. Tippet 210
—— v. White 27
Harrison v. Blades 176. 195
—— v. Harrison 381
Harrison's case 280
Harrington v. Wise 407
Harvey v. Collison 45
Harwood v. Sims 182. 184
—— v. Wallis 460
Haslam's case 31
Hatch v. Blisset 6
Hathaway v. Barrow 88. 238
Havelock v. Rockwood 251
Hawkeswood's case 400
Hawkins v. Wallis 129
Haws v. Hind 44. 268
Haynes v. Hare 424
Hayward v. Firmion 177
Haywood v. Nichols 120
Henkle v. Royal Exchange Assurance Company 459
Helyar v. Hawke 75
Henry v. Adey 290. 301
Henshaw v. Pleasance 254
Herbert v. Ashburner 326
—— v. Cook 253. 287
—— v. Reid 417
—— v. Tuckal 180
Hereford (Bp.) v. Bridgewater (Duke) 330
Heston's case 25
Heward v. Shipley 92
Hewson v. Brown 279
Hick's case 221
Higginson v. Clowes 438
Higham v. Ridgway 174. 192
Hill v. Bateman 260. 261
—— v. Fleming 61
—— v. Patten 395
Hillyard v. Grantham 237
—— v. Jennings 376
Hilton v. King 379
Hindson v. Kersey 97. 375. 376. 378. 379
Hitchen v. Campbell 234. 235
Hoare v. Allen 204
—— v. Cory 117
—— v. Graham 433
Hobhouse v. Hamilton 355
Hobson v. Parker 330
Hockin v. Cooke 160. 432
Hockley v. Lamb 44
Hodge v. Fillis 160
Hodge's case 84
Hodges v. Atkis 332. 334
—— v. Drakeford 386
Hodgson's case 141. 206
Hoe v. Nathrop 246. 299
Hoffman v. Pitt 51
Hogg v. Snaith 433
Holcroft v. Heel 120. 122
—— v. Smith 268. 354
Holland q. t. v. Duffin 398
—— v. Hopkins 146
Holloway v. Rakes 182
Hopewell v. De Pinna 153

Page
Hopkins v. Neal 46. 57
How v. Hall 339
Howard v. Tremaine 271
Howel v. Lock 96. 205
Huddleston v. Briscoe 387
Huffe v. Fowkes 5
Hughes' case 170
——— v. Cornelius 249
Hull (Mayor of) v. Horner 234
Humphreys v. Knight 304
Hunt v. Hort 418
Hunter v. Gibson 133
Hurst v. Watkis 149
Hussey v. Jacob 221
Hutchinson's case 232

I

Ibbotson v. Rhodes 60
Iggulden v. May 423
Ilderton v. Atkinson 53. 54
Illingworth v. Leigh 185. 297. 318
Incledon v. Burges 223
Ingram v. Lea 408
Irnham (Ld.) v. Child 451
Israel v. Benjamin 143. 145. 405
Ivat v. Finch 194
Ives's case 219

J

Jackson v. Cator 448
——— v. Fairbank
Jacob v. Lindsay 79. 169. 386. 399
Jagger's case 68
James v. Hatfield 46. 57
Janson v. Raney 110
——— v. Wilson 274
Jefferies v. Duncombe 166
Jelfs v. Ballard 150
Jenkins v. Quinchant 459
Jenkinson v. Pepys 438
John's case 68. 200. 201
Johnson v. Browning 53
——— v. Gilson 338
——— v. Lewellyn 337

Page
Jones v. Bow 243
——— v. Brooke 47. 55
——— v. Lake 381
——— v. Mason 22. 662
——— v. Newman 411
——— v. Randall 296. 298. 305. 321
——— v. Sandys 390
——— v. White 239
Jory v. Orchard 343
Jordaine v. Lashbrooke 33
Jordan v. Lewis 324
——— v. Sawkins 448
Joynes v. Statham 450. 454. 457
Juxon v. Ld. Byron 111

K

Kahl v. Jansen 76
Kaines v. Knightley 433
Katherine's (St.) Hospital, case of, 320
Kellington (vicar of) v. Trin. Coll. Cambridge 304
Kempland v. Macaulay 76
Kempton dem. Boyfield v. Cross 290. 300
Kenn's case 243
Kennet v. Greenwollers 51. 98
Kensington v. Inglis 395
Kershaw v. Cox 396
Keymer v. Summers 121
Kinder v. Williams 6
Kindersley v. Chase 248. 249. 250. 251
The King v.—see Rex, *infra*.
King dem. Ld. Thanet v. Foster 318
Kingston (Mayor of) v. Horner 119
Kingston's (Duchess of) case 222. 223. 231. 240. 242. 243. 247
Kinnersley v. Orpe 228. 292
Kinsman v. Crooke 267
Kirtland v. Pounsett 166
Kirwan v. Cockburn 306
Knight v. Dauler 292
——— v. Halsey 120
Knill v. Williams 394

Page
Bonnet's Lessee v. Devebaugh and Smith 182
Bostwick v. Lewis 74
Bouchereau v. Le Guen 273
Bours v. Tuckerman 6
Bowditch v. Manley 162
Bowen v. Douglas 11
Bowles v. Bingham 180
Bradley v. Goodyear 199
Brandt d. Van Cortlandt and others v. Dyckman 48
——— d. Cuyler and others v. Livermore 171
Braxton's Adm'x v. Hilyard 56
Brenton's Ex'rs v. Cannon's Ex'rs 114
Brickhouse v. Hunter and others 199
Bridge v. M'Lane et al. 44
——— v. Wellington 96
Bridgman and Holt 214
Brockway v. Kinney 235
Brooks v. Bemiss 164
Brown and Brisseau v. May 13
Brown v. Babcock 34
——— v. Neilson 153
——— v. Brown 195
——— v. Van Deuzer 219
——— v. Union Ins. Co. 250
——— v. Girard 321
Brush v. Taggart 293
Buchanan v. Rucker 254
Buck's Ex'rs v. Tregg's Ex'rs 239
Buckland v. Tankard 33
Bulkley v. Storer 36
——— v. Stewart 226. 228
Burlingham v. Deyer 94
Busby v. Greenslate 47
Bush v. Sheldon 245
Butler v. Warren 46. 53
——— v. Butler 96
——— v. Moore 106
Buttrick and Wife v. Allen 253. 254. 301

C

Cain's Lessee v. Henderson 47
Calhoun's Lessee v. Dunning 222
Call v. Dunning 364
Campbell v. Williamson 321
Canty v. Sumter 33. 57
Cary v. Campbell and Cook 347
Carrol v. M'Whorter 97
Carter v. Pearce 40
——— v. Bellamy 442
Carver v. Tracy 79
Case v. Potter 199
Cates v. Hardacre 206
Caufman v. Presbyterian Congregation of Cedar Spring 182. 347

Page
Champlin v. Tilley 142
Chapman v. Allen 458
Chapmans v. Chapmans 231
Charrington v. Milner 34
Chase and others v. Lincoln 57
Cheriot v. Foussat 249. 251
Chesmer v. Noyes 321
Church v. Hubbart 301
Churchill v. Suter 34
——— v. Speight's Ex'rs 358
Claiborne v. Parrish 173
Clark's Ex'rs v. Hopkins 114
Clark v. Sanderson 364
Clarke v. Russel 437
Clason v. Morris and Mowatt 110
Cleary v. Coor and Hawks 288
Clements v. Eason 357
Cobb v. Curtiss 226
Cocksedge v. Fanshaw 216
Cogbill v. Cogbill and others 57
Cogswell v. Dolliver 199
Cohen v. Hinckley 153
Coit and Pierpont v. Commercial Ins. Co. 434
Cole v. Wendell 416
Coleman v. Wise and others 34
——— v. Wolcott 57
Coles v. Thompson 273
Colman and another v. Anderson 124
Commissioners of Berks County v. Ross 356
Commonwealth v. Battis 81
——— ——— v. Chabbock ib.
——— ——— v. Dillon ib.
——— ——— v. Frost 39. 92
——— ——— v. Hardy 140
——— ——— v. Hutchinson 15. 91
——— ——— v. Kinison 167
——— ——— v. Millard 11
——— ——— v. Messenger and others 339
——— ——— v. Moulton 87
——— ——— v. Shepherd 70. 112
——— ——— v. Snell 91
——— ——— v. Waite 96
Concklin v. Hart 273
Converse v. Symmes 127
Cook v. Holmes 2
——— v. Field 230
——— v. Woodrow 363
——— v. Preston 458
Cooper v. Marsden 195
Cornwell v. Isham 57. 377
Cortelyou v. Van Brundt 420
Cortes v. Billings 95. 97
Corwein v. Hames 48
Cottle v. Payne 114
Cowles v. Wilcox 47
Cranston v. Ex'rs of Kenny 288

Page
Crawford and others v. Morrell 161
Credit v. Brown 79
Croswell v. Byrnes 218
Crondson and others v. Leonard 250
Curren v. Connery 211
Currie v. Donald 32
Curtiss v. Strong 18
Cushman v. Loker 22. 53
Cutts v. United States 348
Cuyler v. Robinson 127

D

Davidson v. Brown 11
Davison's Lessee v. Bloomer 357
De Benneville v. De Benneville 2
De Forest v. Brainerd 161
Delafield v. Hand 301
De Long v. Stanton 236
Deming's Case 27
Dempsey v. Ins. Co. of Philadelphia 250
Den d Farrar v. Hamilton 213
—— d. Hanks v. Tucker 119
—— d. Baker v. Wood 347
Dem d. Beatty v. ——— 36. 44
—— d. Tazewell v. Barnard 124
Dickinson v. Barber 209
Dickson v. Bates 376
Digby v. Stedman 195
Dillon v. Crawly 358
Dinkle's Lessee v. Marshall 416
Dobbin v. Watkins 338
Dodd v. Norris 135
Doe v. Roe 64. 355
Doe d. Fisher and others v. Prosser 124
—— d. Hindley v. Rickarby 182
—— d. Clinton and others v. Phelps 349
——————— v. Campbell ib.
—— d. Barnes v. Prevost 417
Douglas's Lessee v. Sanderson 57. 175
Drake v. Watson 161
Druen v. Lessee of Simpson 157. 347. 416
Drummond v. Lessee of Crutcher 161
Duncan v. Duboys 289
Dunham v. Baker 442
Dunlap v. Ball 114

E

Earl v. Baxter 124
Edie v. East India Company 436
Ellmore v. Mills 301
Emerton v. Andrews 47
England v. Syburn v. Slade 124. 171
Evans v. Smith 161

Page
F

Fairchild v. Beach 36
Falls and Smith v. Belknap 40. 48
Farrel v. M'Clea 79
——— v. Perry 36
Farrington v. Farrington 52
Fehl's Lessee v. Good and another 13
Felter v. Mulliner 293
Fenner v. Lewis 71. 79
Fenton v. Reed 113
——— v. Garlick 254
Field and others v. Holland and others 266
—— v. Biddle 424
Fisher v. Ogle 250
Fisher's Ex'r v. Duncan and Turnbull 13
Fitzhugh v. Runyon 442
Fleming v. Gilbert 444
Fletcher v. Pollard 199
Foot v. Tracy 140
Foote v. Colvin 461
Forbes v. Church 216
Foster v. Suffield 135
——— v. Sinkler 199
——— v. Trull 293
Fotherby v. Pate 57
Fowler v. Bebee and another 170
Fox's Lessee v. Palmer et al. 32. 428
Fox and Payne v. Reil 358
Franklin and others v. Talmadge 161
Frith v. Barker 436

G

Gage v. Stewart 56
Gardere v. Columbian Ins. Co. 301
Gardner v. Preston 133
——— v. Baillie 214
——— v. Hosmer 295
Garwood and others v. Dennis 356
Geyger's Lessee v. Geyger 337
Gilpin v. Vincent 42. 57
Goix v. Low 250
Goodrich v. Walker 361
Gordon v. Bowne 153
——— and others v. Browne's Ex'r 162
Graham v. Cammann 214
Grant and Swift v. M'Lachlin 252
——— v. Jackson et al. 267
Gratz's Lessee v. Ewatt 47
Graves and Barnewall v. Boston Marine Ins. Co. 459
Gray v. Gardner 124
—— v. Goodrich 173
Green v. Brown 153
Greenwood v. Curtis 95
Gregory's Lessee v. Setter 461

	Page
Pederson v. Stoffles	40
Pember v. Mathers	110. 453
Pendock v. Mackinder	23. 24. 376
Pendrel v. Pendrel	176
Penny v. Porter	160
Peppin v. Solomon	159
Perigal v. Nicholson	96. 185. 205
Peto v. Hague	75
Philips v. Bacon	163
——— v. Bury	260
——— v. Eamer	211
——— v. Hunter	225. 253
Philipson v. Chase	195. 343
Phipps v. Parker	363
Pickford v. Gutch	173
Piercy v. ——	270
Piercey's case	320
Pigott's case	128
Pike v. Badmering	385
—— v. Crouch	199. 227
Pirie v. Anderson	311
Pitman v. Madox	195
Pitt v. Green	162
—— v. Night	279
Pitton v. Walter	200. 293. 318
Plunkett v. Cobbett	134
Pollard v. Bell	251
Pomfret v. Smith	188
Pool v. Court	160
Poole v. Bentley	407
Pope v. Skinner	155
Portmore (Ld.) v. Morris	451
Potts v. Durant	316. 317
Powel v. Blacket	362
——— v. Cleaver	384
——— v. Edmunds	592. 437. 438
——— v. Hord	46
——— v. Milbank	151
——— v. Ward	21
Preston (Ld.)'s case	365
——— v. Merceau	437
Price's case	31
——— v. Brown	153
——— v. Dyer	447
——— v. Fletcher	162
——— v. Littlewood	193. 313
Price v. Page	418
Price v. Ld. Torrington	195
Prince v. Blackburn	362. 363
Pritt v. Fairclough	347
Prosser's case	231
Prudham v. Philips	248
Purcell v. Macnamara	163
Putt v. Roster	235
Pye's case	159

R

	Page
Radbourne's case	278
Radford q. t. v. M'Intosh	171
Radnor (Earl of) v. Reeve	262
Rambert v. Cohen	386. 399
Ramsay's case	67
Ramsbottom v. Gosden	450
——————'s case	300
Randal v. Lynch	143
——— v. Randal	459
Randle v. Blackburn	79
Rann v. Hughes	445
Raven v. Dunning	61
Ray v. Clark	301
Read v. Brookman	348
Readshaw v. Wood	164
Reardon v. Swabey	406
Reazon v. Ewbank	61
Rebels (case of)	85
Reculist's case	400
Reed v. Jackson	190. 218. 233
Rees v. Mansel	351
Reid v. Margison	291
Reilly's case	27
Rescous v. Williams	99
Reusse v. Meyers	311
Revet v. Braham	373
Rex v. Abergwilly	181
—— v. Albans (St.) Mayor of	420
—— v. Aickles	313. 339
—— v. Babb	331. 333. 334
—— v. Badby	403
—— v. Ball	137
—— v. Baldwin	229
—— v. Barker	324
—— v. Bedder	61
—— v. Bedell	70
—— v. Bellringer	420
—— v. Benson	297

Page
Rex v. Bentley 231
— v. Bermondsey (St. Mary Magdalen) 57
— v. Blaney 92
— v. Boston 39. 87. 88. 241
— v. Bowler 282
— v. Bramley 70. 180
— v. Bray 37. 38. 40
— v. Bridgeman (Dr.) 332
— v. Broughton 87
— v. Bunting 88
— v. Burdett 163
— v. Carpenter 53. 58. 93. 199
— v. Carr 264
— v. Castel Careinion 24. 208
— v. Castleton 347. 348
— v. Cator 374
— v. Chadderton 181
— v. Chester (Bp.) 404
— v. Chester (Mayor, &c. of) 420
— v. Clayton le-Moors 285
— v. Cliviger 66
— v. Cole 137
— v. Coombs 151
— v. Cornelius 332
— v. Cotton 179
— v. Crossley 312
— v. Crowther 151
— v. Culpeper (Sir T.) 348
— v. Dalby 87
— v. Davis 24. 93
— v. Deborah 200
— v. Doherty 68
— v. East Knoyle 403
— v. Eden 87
— v. Edwards 206
— v. Ellis 87
— v. Eriswell 191. 280. 284
— v. Erith 180
— v. Ferry Friston 181. 284
— v. Fletcher 62
— v. Ford 23. 24. 28
— v. Fox 102
— v. Frederick and Another 66
— v. Fraternity of Hostmen in Newcastle 331

Page
Rex v. Gardener 21. 306
— v. Gibson 247
— v. Gillham 163
— v. Gillson 402
— v. Gisburn 97
— v. Gordon (Ld. G.) 206. 327
— v. Green 21
— v. Greep 28
— v. Grimes 227
— v. Grundon 260
— v. Gwyn 321
— v. Haines 298. 299. 321
— v. Hardwick 60. 72
— v. Hebden 227
— v. Hensey (Dr.) 365
— v. Higgins 215
— v. Holland 325
— v. Hollister 334
— v. Holt 305
— v. Howe 213
— v. Jarvis 150
— v. Mr. Just. Johnson 347
— v. Johnson 92
— v. Jones 32. 357
— v. Kea 70. 180
— v. King and Others 321
— v. Kirdford 48. 51. 93
— v. Lafone and Others 62
— v. Laindon 443
— v. Land-Tax (Commissioners) 321. 326
— v. Lewis 206
— v. Lee 333
— v. Little Lumley 48
— v. Lloyd 121
— v. Locker and Others 66
— v. London, Mayor, &c. of 53
— v. Long Buckby 403
— v. Lookup 163
— v Lucas 334
— v. Luckup 92
— v. Luffe 70. 110. 180
— v. Macartney 87
— v. Major 432
— v. Marriott 150
— v. Mattingley 428
— v. Martin 313
— v. Mead 332

Page
Rex v. Middlezoy 344
—— v. Midlam 324
—— v. Morris 297
—— v. Mothersell 320
—— v. Muscot 108
—— v. Netherthong 350
—— v. Nuneham Courtney 181. 284
—— v. Nunez 38. 87
—— v. Olney 428
—— v. Osbourne 420
—— v. Paget (Ld.) 215
—— v. Paine or Payne 82. 163. 277. 278
—— v. Pancras (St.) 224. 232. 233
—— v. Paul's (St.) Bedford 386. 407
—— v. Pearce 134. 405
—— v. Pendleton 399. 400
—— v. Peter's (St.) 70
—— v. Phipps 59. 94. 95
—— v. Pooley 401
—— v. Preston (Inhab.) 215
—— v. Prosser 48. 50. 51
—— v. Punshon 276
—— v. Purnell (Dr.) 333
—— v. Ravenstone 284
—— v. Reading 70. 180
—— v. Reason and Tranter 200
—— v. Reeks 391
—— v. Rippon (Mayor of) 98
—— v. Rislip 231
—— v. Rogers 151
—— v. Rooke 70
—— v. Ryton 350
—— v. St. Sepulchre 347
—— v. St. Mary's, Nottingham 206
—— v. Sarrat 231
—— v. Scammonden 426
—— v. Scott 420
—— v. Shacklington 21
—— v. Shelley 330. 333
—— v. Smith 214. 326
—— v. South Lynn 51
—— v. Sparkes 104
—— v. Stratford-upon-Avon (Mayor, &c. of) 420
—— v. Stone 74. 150

Page
Rex v. Surry (Justices) 334
—— v. Swallow 32
—— v. Taylor 18. 162
—— v. Teasdale 92
—— v. Teale 24. 208
—— v. Terrington 47
—— v. Tilly 92
—— v. Townshend 224
—— v. Travers 15
—— v. Tucker 15
—— v. Turner 21
—— v. Vandercomb 136. 322. 323
—— v. Varlo 420
—— v. Verelst 171
—— v. Vincent 247
—— v. Vipont 277
—— v. Warden of the Fleet 28. 231
—— v. Warley 285
—— v. Watkinson 105
—— v. West Riding of Yorkshire 348
—— v. Whitley Lower 60
—— v. Whiting 38. 87
—— v. Withers 103. 305
—— v. Woburn 60. 72. 209
—— v. Worsenham 392
—— v. Wych 21
—— v. Wylie 137
—— v. York (Mayor of) 227
Reyner v. Pearson 76
Rhind v. Wilkinson 167
Rhodes's case 88. 312
Ribbands v. Cricket 144
Rice v. Shute 127. 162
Rich v. Jackson 437. 438
Richardson v. Disborow 111
——— v. Edmonds 418
Rickman's case 137
Ridley v. Taylor 39. 54
Right dem. Cater v. Price 379
Roach v. Garvan 252
Roberts v. Fortune 257
——— v. Herbert 154
——— v. Multston 139
Robertson and Thompson v. French 118. 308. 435
Robinson v. Drybrough 388
——— v. Smith 11
——— v. Touray 398

Page
Robinson's case 226. 235
Robson v. Hall 405
——— v. Kemp 105
Roche's case 252
——— v. Campbell 160
Rockwood's case 212
Roddam's case 9
Roderick v. Hovil 404
Rodriguez v. Tadmire 140
Roe v. Aylmer 330. 333
—— ex dem. Beebe v. Parker
——————— Bennet v. Jeffery 315
——————— Brune v. Rawlings 193
——————— Pellatt v. Ferrars 265
——————— West v. Davis 340
Rogers v. Allen 187
——— v. Brooks 120
Rolf v. Dart 291
Roll v. Fellow 182
Rookwood's case 27. 28
Rose v. Bryant 117
Ross v. Hunter 150
Roulston v. Clarke 162
Rudd's case 29. 30. 37. 94
Ruding v. Newel 130
Rugby Charity (Trustees of) v. Merryweather 121
Rushworth v. Pembroke (Countess) and Currier 227. 231. 268
Russell's case 88
Rustell v. Macquister 134. 135
Ruston's case 14. 17
Rutland (Countess of)'s case 424

S

St. Cross (Master, &c. of) v. Ld. Howard de Walden 432
St. George and St. Margaret parishes 113. 152
St. Katharine Hosp. (case of) 320

Page
St. Legar v. Adams 246. 377
Saloucci v. Woodmass 250
Salter v. Thomas 313
Samuel v. Evans 220
Sandwell v. Sandwell 209
Sarum (Earl) v. Spencer 286
Saunders v. Pitman 11
Savage q. t. v. Smith 158
Sawtell v. Lewdon 398
Saxby v. Kirkus 220
Say and Seale (Lord)'s case 103. 105
Sayer v. Kitchen 211
Schimmel v. Lousada 4
Schinotti v. Bumstead 328
Scory's case 281
Scott v. Jones 339. 400
—— v. Shearman 254. 255
Searle v. Ld. Barrington 115
——— v. Williams 25. 26
Seddon v. Tutop 235
Selby v. Harris 292
Selword v. Mildmay 412. 417
Sergeson v. Sealey 282
Sheers (Sir G.)'s case 332
Shelly v. Wright 356
Shelling v. Farmer 329
Shephard v. Gosnold 420
——— v. Shorthouse 299
Shergold v. Boone 460
Shires v. Glascock 382
Short v. Edwards 147
Shotter v. Friend 107. 111
Shuttleworth v. Bravo 52
——————— v. Stevens 53
Sidney (Algernon) case of 365
Simmonds v. Knight 275
Skipp v. Harwood 21
Skrine v. Elmore 408
Slack v. Buchanan 79
Slade's case 235
Sloper v. Allen 156
Small v. Allen 428
Smalt v. Whitmill 4
Smartle v. Williams 353. 354
Smith v. Coney 411
——— v. Davies 330
——— v. Evans 379
——— v. Fuge 309
——— v. Lyon 72

	Page
Smith v. Prager	39. 90
——— v. Rummens	88. 241
——— v. Taylor	171. 172
——— v. Veal	269
——— v. Woodward	349
——— v. Young	79. 80. 169
Smith's case	84. 110. 170
——— (Accountant)'s case	231
Snaith v. Mingay	388
Snead v. Robinson	31
Snow v. Philips	263
Snowdon v. Smith	140
Some v. Taylor	432
Somerset (Duke of) v. France	130. 131
Southampton (Mayor of) v. Graves	332
Spalding v. Mure	127
Sparin v. Drax	264
Sparry's case	234
Spence v. Stuart	6
Spenceley v. Schullenberg	105
——— v. De Willott	210
Spencer v. Golding	95
Spieres v. Parker	150
Sponsenby's case	89
Stafford (Ld.)'s case	279
Stainer v. Burg. of Droitwich	320
Stammers v. Dixon	421
Standen v. Standen	418
Stanley (Sir T.) v. White	132. 194
Stead v. Heaton	192
Stephens v. Crichton	11
Stevens v. Moss	180
Stone v. Bale	429
Stonehouse v. Evelyn	381
Stoytes v. Pearson	128
Stretch v. Wheeler	5
Strickland v. Ward	260
Stump v. Ayliffe	304
Sturdy v. Andrews	3. 4
Surtees v. Hubbard	342
Sutton v. Bishop	24
——— v. Buck	118
Swan's case	278
Swendson's case	67
Swinnerton v. Marquis of Stafford	318
Swire v. Bell	362. 363
Sydenham v. Rand	4
Symonds v. Knox	163

T

Talbot v. Villeboys	330
Tanner v. Taylor	209
Taylor v. Cole	263
——— v. Hague	389
——— v. Royal Exchange Company	11
——— v. Scott	21
Taylor's case	88
Tempest v. Rawling	407
Terry v. Huntington	256
Tewkesbury (Bailiff, &c. of) v. Bricknell	420
Thanet (Ld.) v. Paterson	295
Thatcher's case	280
Theobold v. Tregott	95
Thomas's case	81
Thomas v. Fraser	459
——— v. Thomas	414
Thompson's case	81
Thompson and Wife v. Trevannion	181. 203
Thornton v. Lyster	165
Thornton v. Royal Exch. Assurance Company	209
Thurle v. Madison	353
Thurston v. Slatford	214. 292
Thwaites v. Richardson	73
Tiley v. Cowling	65
Tilly's case	268
Tinkler's case	201
Tinkler v. Walpole	309
Tinney v. Tinney	424
Tisdale v. Essex (Sir Wm.)	407
Title v. Grevet	206
Thompson v. Smith	248
Tong's case	31. 82. 276
Took's case	138
Tooker v. Beaufort (D.)	282
Toole v. Medlicott	110
Totty v. Nesbitt	348
Towers v. Moore	419
——— v. Osborne (Sir J.)	408
Townsend v. Ives	378

Page
The People v. Bill 62
——— v. Dowelle 9
——— v. Herrick 207
——— v. Holbrook 339
——— v. Howell 36. 91
——— v. Humphreys 74
——— v. Poyllon 323
——— v. Runkel 161
——— v. Van Wyck 4
Pepoon v. Jenkins 301
Peter v. Cake 159
Peterson v. Willing et al. 40
Petherick v. Turner 266
Pettingal v. Brown 36. 39
Peyton v. Hallett 51
Phelps v. Hall 40
——— v. Hartwell 151
——— v. Holker 254
——— v. Winchel 36
Phetheon v. Whitmore 33
Phillips and Butler v. Rose 161
Phœnix v. Assignees of Ingraham 51. 194. 266
Piddock v. Brown et al. 61
Pierce v. Chase 36. 96
Pierson v. Hooker 427
Piggott v. Holloway 358
Pitt v. Smith 128
Platner v. Best 235
Pleasants v. Pemberton 34
Plumb v. Whiting 43
Poindexter's Ex'rs v. Barker 289
Poole and others v. Richardson 375
Porter v M'Clure 36. 44
Potter v. Luther 170
Poulteney et al. v. Ross 199
Powell v. Biddle 416
President, &c. of Hartford Bank v. Hart 74
Prime v. Smith 199
———'s Ex'rs v. Swett ib.
Proprietors of Kennebeck Purchase v. Call 96. 289
Purcell v. Purcell 113
Purrington v. Loring 295
Putnam v. Churchill 34

Q

Quince's Adm'rs v. Ross's Adm'rs 114

R

Radcliff v. United Ins. Co. 250. 305
Rankin v. Blackwell 153
Rapp v. Le Blanc et al. 92
Raven et al. v. Dunning & Chilton 62
Rea v. Hayden 127
Reed v. Passer 113

Page
Regina v. Inhabitants of Barking 166
——— v. Drake ib.
Reichart v. Castator 416
Reinsdyck v. Kane et al. 63
Renaudet v. Crocken 96
Respublica v. Keating 91
——— v. M'Carty 84
——— v. Ross 34. 91
Revere v. Leonard and another 411
Rex v. Barber 200
——— v. Beach 166
——— v. Berry 155
——— v. Blackman 93
——— v. Carty 83
——— v. Cole 93
——— v. D'Eon 11
——— v. D'Faria 87
——— v. Emden 235
——— v. Gilham 20
——— v. Hart 166
——— v. Jackson 366
——— v. Kelly 15
——— v. Killerby 48
——— v. May 166
——— v. Shears 366
——— v. Sparkes 106
——— v. Tandy 366
——— v. White 15
Rice v. King 235
Rich v. Tapping 33
Richards v. Stewart 167
——— v. Dutch 418
Richardson's Ex'rs v. Hunt 43
——— v. Lessee of Stewart 211. 213
Ridgely and another v. Spenser 293
Riggs v. Denniston 103
Roberts v. Stanton 349. 350
Robinson v. Fisher 127
——— and another v. Jones 250
——— v. Ex'rs of Ward 254
——— v. Clifford 301
Rochell ads. Holmes 347
Rodman & others v. Forman 163
——— v. Hoop's Ex'r 199
Rogers v. Briley 13
———'s Ex'rs v. Berry 16
——— & Rogers v. Van Hoesen and others 338
Roget v. Merritt & Clapp 440
Rose v. Himeley 249. 251
Ross v. Bruce 340
Rotheroe et al. v. Elton 47
Ruan v. Gardner 94. 321. 436
——— v. Perry 139
Rucker v. Palsgrave 142
Rugan v. West 274
Ryer v. Atwater 222. 236

Page

S

Salter v. Speir 110
Saxton v. Hutcheson & Johnson 162
Sayer v. Kitchen 338
Schermerhorn v Jenkins 127
——— v. Vanderheyden 438
Schlosser v. Lesher 11
Scriba v. Ins. Co. N. A. 321
Seagrove v. Redman et al. 199
Sears v. Brink 440
Seekright d. Wright & Wife v. Bogan 57
Senat v. Porter 321
Sessions v. Barfield 427
Seton v. Delaware Ins. Co. 301
Shaeffer v. Kreitzer 293
Shaffer's Lessee v. Corbett 376
Shaller and another v. Brand 385
Shanks & M'Rae v. Fenwick 13
Sharp v. Thatcher 57
Sheeler v. Speer 205
Sheldon v. Ackley 47
Shepherd v. Watrous 238
Sherwood v. Burr 122
Sikes v. Ransom 214
Simons v. Payne 100
Sintzenick v. Lucas 236
Skinner v. Henderson 424
Slade v. Teasdale 199
Sleght v. Rhinelander and others 145
Sloman v. Herne et al. 103
Sluby v. Champlin 79. 192. 362. 363
Smallwood v. Mitchell 338
Smith v. Barker 11. 161
——— v. Chambers 47
——— v. Carrington 56. 167. 214
——— v. Ludlow 73
——— v. Brush 161
——— v. Steinback 216
——— v. Lewis 226
——— v. Rhoades 254
——— v. Elder 301
——— v. Blagge ib.
——— v. Fenner 371. 428
——— and Stanley v. Wright 434
Smythe v. Banks 6
Snider & Van Vechten v. Croy 235
Snowden v. Phœnix Ins. Co. 216
——— v. Hemming 424
Snyder's Lessee v. Snyder 65. 205. 427
Southwick v. Stevens 166
Spalding v. Huntington 423
Spencer v. Spencer 245. 347
Spitty v. Bowens 44
Stansbury v. Marks 127
Stanton v. Bird's Ex'rs 58
Starr v. Starr 376
State v. Adams 125

Page

State v. Brunsen 372
——— v. Clark 43
——— v. Coulter 94
——— v. Green 137
——— v. Hasset 87
——— v. Jenkins 81
——— v. Irwin 82
——— v. Long 81
——— v. Love 126
——— v. Woody 200
——— v. Moore 84
——— v. Norris 212
——— v. Smith & Cameron 8
——— v. Street 162
Steele v. Phœnix Ins. Co. 57
Steinback v. Columbian Ins. Co. 209. 216
——— v. Rhinelander 34
Steinmetz et al. v. Currie 97
Stephens v. White 216
Sterrett v. Bull and others 199
Stevenson v. Beecker 288
Stewart v. Kip 36. 40
——— v. Richards 96
——— v. Warner 249
Stille v. Lynch 34
Stockham v. Jones and others 40. 62
Stoever v. Lessee of Whitman 124. 175. 321
Storer v. Logan and others 34
——— v. Freeman 427
Story v. Strettel 321
Stratton v. Rastall 73
Strickland's Lessee v. Pool 174
Strout and another v. Berry 121
Stubbs v. Burwell 424
Stultz v. Dickey 429
Sumpter v. Murrell 288
Sweet v. Overseers of Clinton 215
Sweitzer's Lessee v. Mease and others 47
Swift v. Dean 47. 96
——— v. Hawkins 424
Symes's Lessee v. Irvine 11

T

Tabb and others v. Archer and others 424
Talbot v. Seaman 301
Tate v. Wellings 161
Tayler v. Bryden 254
Telts et Ux. v. Foster & Williams 113
Temple's Ex'r v. Ellett's Ex'x 51
Thomas's Lessee v. Horlocker 349
Thompson v. Jameson 162
——— v. Bullock 167. 349
——— v. Ketcham 433. 444
Titford v. Knott 211
Tobey v. Barber 73

Page
Tom v. Goodrich and others 127
Torrey v. Fuller 167
Townsend v. Weld 424
Tower v. Wilson 313.
Tracey v. Harkins 155
Treadwell and another v. Bulkley and another 427
Treasurer of the State v. Nall 36. 94
Trott v. Wood 434
Trustees of Lansingburgh v. Willard 43
Trustees of Huntington v. Nicoll 63
Tullidge v. Wade 135
Tunno v. Rogers & M'Bride 195
Turpin v. Thomas 222
Turvill v. Aynsworth 166
Tuttle v. Russell 213
Twambley v. Henley 47
Twemlow and others v. Oswin 153

V

Vail v. Nickerson 20
—— v. Lewis & Livingston 163
Vandenheuvel v. United Ins. Co. 250
Vandervoort and others v. Smith 71. 301. 433
—— v. Columbian Ins. Co. 273
Van Dyck v. Vanbeuren 124
Van Nuys v. Terhune 36. 47
Vansant v. Boileau 46. 57
Van Valkenburgh v. Rouk 128
Vasse v. Ball 250. 251
The United States v. Frink 11
—— v. Johns 87. 289. 311
—— v. Mitchell 135
—— v. Vigol 158. 164
—— v. Porter 160
—— v. Sears et al. 171
—— v. Smith 206
—— v. Burr 206
—— v. Thompson 424
Verplank v. Sterry 361
Vosburgh v. Thayer 199

W

Waggoner v. Gray's Adm'rs 63. 79
Wakely v. Hart and others 36. 61. 62
Wailing v. Toll 127
Waldo v. Long 234. 293
Walker v. Broadstock 182
Wallace v. Child & Styles 95
—— v. Baker 442
Wallis v. Mease 134
Walpole v. Ewer 301
Waring v. Warren 169. 182. 338
Ward v. Wells 362
Warren v. Merry 34
—— v. Lynch 361
Washburn v. Merrils 458
Watson v. Delafield 273
Webb v. Danforth 34
Webster v. Lee 56
Wills v. Tucker 13. 56
—— v. Lane 42
Wharam v. Routledge 338
Whatley & others v. Tricker and others 445
Wheeler v. Van Houten 236
Wheelwright v. Depeyster 250. 251
White v. Derby 51
—— v. Kibling 34. 200
—— v. Lynch 11
—— v. Ward & Aylesworth 225. 226
—— v. Eagan 427
Whitlock v. Ramsey's Adm'x 161
Whitney v. Ferris 73
Widdifield v. Widdifield 171
Widgery v. Munroe and another 34
Williams v. Ogle 166
—— v. Davis 357
Willoughby v. Carleton 357
Wilmot v. Monson 161
Wilson v. Lenox 34
—— v. Codman's Ex'r 159
—— & Gibbs v. Conine 294. 295
Wilt v. Franklin 424
Winthrop v. Union Ins. Co. 273. 321. 436
Winton v. Saidler 34
Wise v. Wilcox 32
Wolcott v. Hall 140
Wood v. Roach 167
Woodhull v. Holmes 34
Woods v. Williams 97
—— v. Courteen et al. 311
Wright v. Sharp 214
Wroe v. Washington & others 216

Y

Yarborough v. Beard 352. 356
Young v. Bairner 46
—— and others v. The Commonwealth 170

Z

Zantzinger v. Ketch 424
Ziele v. Ex's of Campbell 127

Page
Townsend (Marquis) v. Stangroom 450. 453. 455
Trelawnay v. Thomas 47
Trowel v. Castle 295
Tuckey v. Flower 321
Tuffnell v. Page 375
Turner v. Crisp 117
——— v. Eyles 158. 164
——— v. Gethin 329
——— v. Peart 96. 205
Tyley v. Cowling 232
Tyte v. Jones 386

U

Uhde v. Walters 433
Uncle v. Watson 182. 194
Underhill v. Durham 304
Usher's case 89

V

Vallance v. Dewar 434
Vane (Lord)'s case 68
—— (Sir H.)'s case 215
Vaughan's case 85
——— v. Barnes 142
Venning v. Leckie 407
Vernon's case 425
Vicary's case 73
Villiers v. Villiers 347
——— and Beamont's case 425
Vowels v. Young 174. 176

W

Waddington v. Bristow 408
——— v. Francis 392
Waddy v. Newton 432
Wade v. Beasley 146. 386
Wagstaff v. Wagstaff 375
Wain v. Walters 437. 439
Wakefield's case 4
Waldridge v. Kennison 72
Waldron v. Coombe 288
Walker v. Kearny 22
——— v. Walker 457
——— v. Witter 253
Wallace v. Cook 312

Page
Wallis's case 157
Wallis v. De Lancy 362. 363
Walpole (Ld.) v. Ld. Cholmondeley 414
Walter v. Horsfall 399
Walton v. Hobbs 110
——— v. Shelley 33
Ward v. Apprice 337
—— v. Haydon 62
Wardel v. Fermor 362. 363
Wardle's case 159
Warneford v. Warneford 379
Warren v. Grenville 192
——— v. Stagg 439
Warriner v. Giles 328
Warrington v. Feubor 408
Warwick (Lord)'s case 24. 25. 26. 27
——— v. Bruce 409
Warwickshall's case 81. 83
Watkins v. Towers 143
Watt's case 88. 89. 271
Weal v. King 160
Webb v. Petts 190
Webber v. Maddocks 397
Weeks v. Sparke 182. 189. 190
Welborn's case 201
Welch v. Richards 326
Weld v. Hornby 420
Weller v. Foundling Hospit. 57
Well's case 89
Westbeech v. Kennedy 381
Westbeer's case 28. 277
West (Dr.)'s case 331. 332
Weston v. Emes 433
Wetherston v. Edington 344
Wharam v. Routledge 212
Whateley v. Menheim and Levy 232
Wheeler v. Lowth 295
Wheeling's case 61
Whelpdale's case 123
Whitbread v. May 413
Whitcombe v. Whiting 73
Whitlocke v. Baker 175
Whitewell v. Dinsdale 400
Whitwell v. Bennett 160
White's case 17
White v. Cuyler 69
—— v. Parkin 435

Page
White v. Sayer 429
——— v. Wilson 160. 434
Widrington (Dr.)'s case 259
Wigglesworth v. Dallison 429
Wigley v. Jones 164
Wild's case 31
Williams v. East India Company 151. 167.
——— v. Johnson 71
——— v. Innes 77
——— v. Stevens 52
Williamson v. Allison 158. 159
Willis's case 84
Wilsford v. Wood 127
Wilson v. Clarke 165
——— v. Gilbert 165
——— v. Hodges 152
——— v. Rogers 326
——— v. Turner 78
——— v. Rastall 103. 104
Wiltzie v. Adamson 198
Winsmore v. Greenbank 64
Winch v. Winchester 450
Wing v. Earle 432
Withnell v. Gartham 190. 421
Wood and others v. Braddick 73. 266
——— v. Drury 362
Woodcock's case 68. 200. 201. 276. 277
Woodcraft v. Kinaston 290
Woodnas v. Mason 291
Woodnoth v. Cobham (Ld.) 185
Woodward's case 118
Woollam v. Hearn 450. 455
Woollet v. Roberts 263
Worsley v. Filisker 217
Wright d. Clymer v. Littler 201
——— v. Pindar 216
——— v. Wakeford 358
Wrottesley v. Bendish and Wife 267
Wyatt v. Wilkinson 51
Wych v. Meal 266
Wyndham v. Lord Wycombe 140
——— v. Chetwynd 97. 376

Y

Yabsley v. Doble 76
Yate v. Leigh 195
——— v. Willan 145
Yates v. Boen 128
Yewin's case 211

TABLE

OF CASES CITED IN THE NOTES TO THIS EDITION.

A

Page

ABBY v. Goodrich 47. 97
Adams v. Lingard et al. 33
——— v. Spear 162
Alexander v. Mahon 54. 167
Allen v. Holkins 34
Allesbrook v. Roach 372
Allison v. Matthieu 133
Alston's Lessee v. Saunders 119
Alston v. Taylor 192
Alves v. Bunbury, 301
Amey v. Long, 12
Amory v. Fellowes 376
Anderson v. Henshaw 142
——— v. Robson, 347
Andrews' Lessee v. Fleming 182
Angel v. Felton 347
Anonymous 11. 103. 301
Archer v. Sadler 119
Armstrong v. Carson's Ex'rs 254
Atkinson v. Ex'rs of Scott 424
Avarillo v. Rogers 155
Austin v. Bradley 51
———'s Adm'x v. Whitlock's Ex'rs 361

B

Bailey & Bogert v. Ogdens 53. 95
——— v. Freeman 440
——— and others v. Fairplay 236
Baird v. Blaigrove 361
Baker & Rowlson v. Arnold 34. 36. 106. 212
——— v. Jewell 127
——— v. Blount 362
——— v. Seekright 427
Ball v. Barnes et al. 97
Ballard v. Walker 446. 445
Balls v. Westwood 171
Baring v. Reeder 34. 36. 53. 71
——— v. Shippen 34
Barker v. Prentiss 34. 433
——— and Knapp v. Miller 118. 294

Page

Barlow v. Todd 238
Barnes v. Holloway 155
Bartlet v. Delprat and others 182
——— v. Knight 254
Baxter v. Baxter 64
——— et al. v. New-England Marine Ins. Co. 250
Baylies and another v. Fettyplace and another, 126. 161
Beal v. Thatcher 133
Beals v. Guernsey 200
Beard's Ex'r v. Cowman's Ex'r 57
Beatty v. Smith and Thompson 110
Bebee and others v. The Bank of New-York 63
Beers v. Botsford 161
Belden v. Carter 361
Bell's Case 81
Bent v. Baker 33. 34
Benton v. Duffy 235
Betts v. Badger 346
Biays v. Merrihew 273
Biddis v. James 289
Bigger's Adm'r v. Alderson 124
Biggs v. Benger and Greenfield 142
Bingham v. Cabot et al. 76
Binney v. Merchant 58
Bird v. Thompson 47
——— v. Randall 126
Birt v. Wood 56
Bissell v. Kip 164
——— v. Briggs 254
Blackley v. Sheldon 294
Blacklock v. Stewart 251
Blanton v. Miller 57
Blasdale v. Babcock 234
Bliss v. Thompson 429
Bloodgood v. Overseers of Jamaica 48
Blount v. Starkey's Adm'rs 114
Boddy v. Smith 166
Bonafous v. Walker 154

Page
Bonnet's Lessee v. Devebaugh and Smith 182
Bostwick v. Lewis 74
Bouchereau v. Le Guen 273
Bours v. Tuckerman 6
Bowditch v. Manley 162
Bowen v. Douglas 11
Bowles v. Bingham 180
Bradley v. Goodyear 199
Brandt d. Van Cortlandt and others v. Dyckman 48
——— d. Cuyler and others v. Livermore 171
Braxton's Adm'x v. Hilyard 56
Brenton's Ex'rs v. Cannon's Ex'rs 114
Brickhouse v. Hunter and others 199
Bridge v. M'Lane et al. 44
——— v. Wellington 96
Bridgman and Holt 214
Brockway v. Kinney 235
Brooks v. Bemiss 164
Brown and Brisseau v. May 13
Brown v. Babcock 34
——— v. Neilson 153
——— v. Brown 195
——— v. Van Deuzer 219
——— v. Union Ins. Co. 250
——— v. Girard 321
Brush v. Taggart 233
Buchanan v. Rucker 254
Buck's Ex'rs v. Tregg's Ex'rs 239
Buckland v. Tankard 33
Bulkley v. Storer 36
——— v. Stewart 226. 228
Burlingham v. Deyer 94
Busby v. Greenslate 47
Bush v. Sheldon 245
Butler v. Warren 46. 53
——— v. Butler 96
——— v. Moore 106
Buttrick and Wife v. Allen 253. 254. 301

C

Cain's Lessee v. Henderson 47
Calhoun's Lessee v. Dunning 222
Call v. Dunning 364
Campbell v. Williamson 321
Canty v. Sumter 33. 57
Cary v. Campbell and Cook 347
Carrol v. M'Whorter 97
Carter v. Pearce 40
——— v. Bellamy 442
Carver v. Tracy 79
Case v. Potter 199
Cates v. Hardacre 206
Caufman v. Presbyterian Congregation of Cedar Spring 182. 347

Page
Champlin v. Tilley 142
Chapman v. Allen 458
Chapmans v. Chapmans 231
Charrington v. Milner 34
Chase and others v. Lincoln 57
Cheriot v. Foussat 249. 251
Chesmer v. Noyes 321
Church v. Hubbart 301
Churchill v. Suter 34
——— v. Speight's Ex'rs 358
Claiborne v. Parrish 173
Clark's Ex'rs v. Hopkins 114
Clark v. Sanderson 364
Clarke v. Russel 437
Clason v. Morris and Mowatt 110
Cleary v. Coor and Hawks 288
Clements v. Eason 357
Cobb v. Curtiss 226
Cocksedge v. Fanshaw 216
Cogbill v. Cogbill and others 57
Cogswell v. Dolliver 199
Cohen v. Hinckley 153
Coit and Pierpont v. Commercial Ins. Co. 434
Cole v. Wendell 416
Coleman v. Wise and others 34
——— v. Wolcott 57
Coles v. Thompson 273
Colman and another v. Anderson 124
Commissioners of Berks County v. Ross 356
Commonwealth v. Battis 81
——— ——— v. Chabbock ib.
——— ——— v. Dillon ib.
——— ——— v. Frost 39. 92
——— ——— v. Hardy 140
——— ——— v. Hutchinson 15. 91
——— ——— v. Kinison 167
——— ——— v. Millard 11
——— ——— v. Messenger and others 339
——— ——— v. Moulton 87
——— ——— v. Shepherd 70. 112
——— ——— v. Snell 91
——— ——— v. Waite 96
Concklin v. Hart 273
Converse v. Symmes 127
Cook v. Holmes 2
——— v. Field 230
——— v. Woodrow 363
——— v. Preston 458
Cooper v. Marsden 195
Cornwell v. Isham 57. 377
Cortelyou v. Van Brundt 420
Cortes v. Billings 95. 97
Corwein v. Hames 48
Cottle v. Payne 114
Cowles v. Wilcox 47
Cranston v. Ex'rs of Kenny 268

Page
Crawford and others v. Morrell 161
Credit v. Brown 79
Croswell v. Byrnes 218
Crondson and others v. Leonard 250
Curren v. Connery 211
Currie v. Donald 32
Curtiss v. Strong 18
Cushman v. Loker 22. 53
Cutts v. United States 348
Cuyler v. Robinson 127

D

Davidson v. Brown 11
Davison's Lessee v. Bloomer 357
De Benneville v. De Benneville 2
De Forest v. Brainerd 161
Delafield v. Hand 301
De Long v. Stanton 236
Deming's Case 27
Dempsey v. Ins. Co. of Philadelphia 250
Den d Farrar v. Hamilton 213
—— d. Hanks v. Tucker 119
—— d. Baker v. Wood 347
Dem d. Beatty v. ——— 36. 44
—— d. Tazewell v. Barnard 124
Dickinson v. Barber 209
Dickson v. Bates 376
Digby v. Stedman 195
Dillon v. Crawly 358
Dinkle's Lessee v. Marshall 416
Dobbin v. Watkins 338
Dodd v. Norris 135
Doe v. Roe 64. 355
Doe d. Fisher and others v. Prosser 124
—— d. Hindley v. Rickarby 132
—— d. Clinton and others v. Phelps 349
——————— v. Campbell ib.
—— d. Barnes v. Prevost 417
Douglas's Lessee v. Sanderson 57. 175
Drake v. Watson 161
Druen v. Lessee of Simpson 157. 347. 416
Drummond v. Lessee of Crutcher 161
Duncan v. Duboys 289
Dunham v. Baker 442
Dunlap v. Ball 114

E

Earl v. Baxter 124
Edie v. East India Company 436
Ellmore v. Mills 301
Emerton v. Andrews 47
England v. Syburn v. Slade 124. 171
Evans v. Smith 161

Page
F

Fairchild v. Beach 36
Falls and Smith v. Belknap 40. 48
Farrel v. M'Clea 79
——— v. Perry 36
Farrington v. Farrington 52
Fehl's Lessee v. Good and another 13
Felter v. Mulliner 293
Fenner v. Lewis 71. 79
Fenton v. Reed 113
——— v. Garlick 254
Field and others v. Holland and others 266
—— v. Biddle 424
Fisher v. Ogle 250
Fisher's Ex'r v. Duncan and Turnbull 13
Fitzhugh v. Runyon 442
Fleming v. Gilbert 444
Fletcher v. Pollard 199
Foot v. Tracy 140
Foote v. Colvin 461
Forbes v. Church 216
Foster v. Suffield 135
——— v. Sinkler 199
——— v. Trull 293
Fotherby v. Pate 57
Fowler v. Bebee and another 170
Fox's Lessee v. Palmer et al. 32. 428
Fox and Payne v. Reil 358
Franklin and others v. Talmadge 161
Frith v. Barker 436

G

Gage v. Stewart 56
Gardere v. Columbian Ins. Co. 301
Gardner v. Preston 133
——— v. Baillie 214
——— v. Hosmer 295
Garwood and others v. Dennis 356
Geyger's Lessee v. Geyger 337
Gilpin v. Vincent 42. 57
Goix v. Low 250
Goodrich v. Walker 361
Gordon v. Bowne 153
——— and others v. Browne's Ex'r 162
Graham v. Cammann 214
Grant and Swift v. M'Lachlin 252
——— v. Jackson et al. 267
Gratz's Lessee v. Ewatt 47
Graves and Barnewall v. Boston Marine Ins. Co. 459
Gray v. Gardner 124
—— v. Goodrich 173
Green v. Brown 153
Greenwood v. Curtis 95
Gregory's Lessee v. Setter 461

Page
Grover v. Green 6
Gurney v. Dessies 16
H
Hackley v. Patrick 73. 273
Hadfield v. Jameson 301
Hall's Case 82
Hall and another v. Huse 74
—— v. Phelps 358
Halsey v. Brown and others 434
Hamilton v. Cutts and others 234
——— v. Williams 362
———'s Lessee v. Mursden 362
Hantz v. Hull 299
Hardaway v. Manson 13
Harget v. Blackshear 294
Harper v. Brock 124
Harris v. Johnston 443
Harrison v. Brock 216
Hart v. M'Intosh 33
Harvey v. Harvey 113
Hasbrouck v. Lown 37. 97
——— v. Baker 293
Hasselden v. Bradney 119
Haswell v. Bussing 57
Hatch v. Hatch 361
Hathorn and others v. King 209
Hawley v. Brown 377
Hayes v. Grier 44
Hecker v. Jarret 76
Heckert v. Haine 57. 357
Heermance v. Vernoy 47
Heffner v. Miller and others 118
Hempstead v. Bird 321
Henderson v. Moore 153
Henry's Lessee v. Morgan 47. 97
Hepburn and Dundas v. Auld 124
Herrick v. Carman 433
Heyl v. Burling 97
Heyward v. Hazard 375
Hicks v. Fitzsimmons 95
Higginson v. Mein 118
High v. Wilson 294
Highland Turnpike Co. v. M'Kean 320
Hillary v. Waller 124
Hill v. Payson et al. 32
Hitchcock v. Fitch and Aicken 254
——— v. Tyson 145
Hoffman and Seton v. Smith 103
Hogan v. Del. Ins. Co. 433
Holladay v. Littlepage 192
Holmes v. Nuncaster 294
Homer v. Dorr 436
Hooper and others v. Royster and Wife 97
Hopkins v. Smith 79
——— v. De Graffenreid 363. 384
Hotchkiss v. Nichols 263
Hovey v. Hovey 268

Page
Howard v. Cobb 73
Howes v. Barker 427
Howland and others v. Lenox and Maitland 4
Hoyt v. Wildfire 37
—— v. Gelston and Schenck 259
Hubbell v. Coudrey 254
Hughes's Adm'rs v. Stoke's Adm'rs 69
Hulle v. Heghtman 301
Humphrey v. Moxen 34
Huntington v. Rumnill 234
Hurst's Case 5
Hurst v. Dippo 216
——'s Lessee v. Kirkbridge 416
I
Jackson et al. v. Winchester, 200
——— d. Anderson and another v. M'Leod 171
——— d. Beach and others v. Durland 377
——— d. Bleecker v. Whitford 171
——— d. Bunnell and Goodyear v. Foster 427
——— d. Burhans v. Blanshan 349. 385
——— d. Burr and O'Reilly v. Shearman 182. 343
——— d. Bush and others v. Hasbrouck 347
——— d. Caldwell v. Hallenback 47. 53
——— d. Coe and others v. Knifen 200
——— d. Cooder and others v. Woods 377
——— d. Denniston and others v. Denniston 377
——— d. Dickson and others v. Stanley 416
——— d. Donally and others v. Walsh 124. 319
——— d. Donaldson v. Lucett 347. 378
——— d. Dunbar and others v. Todd 347
——— d. Gillespy and others v. Woolsey 199 347
——— d. Goose and others v. Demarest 124
——— d. Griswold and another v. Bard 44. 182. 428
——— d. Hardenburgh and others v. Schoonmaker 345. 428
——— d. Houseman v. Hart 416
——— d. Kane v. Sternburgh 461
——— d. Kincaid v. Scott 2
——— d. Lewis and others v. Laroway 385

Page
Jackson d. Livingston and others v. Neely 347
——— v. Burton 364
——— d. Low and others v. Reynolds 171
——— d. Mapes v. Frost and Haff 32
——— d. Martin and others v. Pratt 118
——— d. M'Donald v. M'Call 124. 182
——— d. The People v. Wood 118
——— v. Pierce 118
——— d. Potter and Calvin v. Bailey 200
——— d. Ross and others v. Cooley 175
——— d. Schuyler and others v. Vedder 222
——— d. Smith and another v. Stewart 124
——— d. Stoutenburgh and others v. Merry 124
——— d. Van Alen v. Vosburgh 171
——— d. Van Dusen v. Van Dusen 44. 151. 371
——— d. Van Den Burgh v. Trusdell 48
——— d. Van Slyck and others v. Son 211. 338
——— d. Van Vechten v. Sill and others 412. 423
——— d. Watson v. Cris 173
——— d. Wood v. Harrow 292
——— d. Woodhull v. Rumsey 51. 100. 378
——— d. Wyckoff v. Humphrey 32
——— d. Youngs and others v. Vredenburgh 56. 182
Jacobson v. Fountain 44. 45. 97
January v. Goodman 357
Jenkins v. Putnam 249
Jenner v. Joliffe 293
Jerome v. Whitney 161
Ingram v. Hall 363
Innis v. Miller 51
Johnson v. Bourn 32. 37
——— v. Medlicott 128
——— v. Smith 235
——— v. Mason 356
Johnston v. Caulkins 139
——— v. Columbian Ins. Co. 142
——— v. Tait 155
——— v. Ludlow 250
Jones v. Coolidge 34
——— v. Hake 94
——— v. Ins. Co. of North America 214
Jones v. Scriven 225
——— et. al. v. Fales 347
——— and Temple v. Logwood 361
——— v. Brinckley 362
———'s Adm'rs v. Blount's Ex'rs 364
——— v. Robertson 428
Irving v. Irving 363
Irwin v. Caryell 46
——— v. Knox 235
Judson and Wife v. Lake 245

K

Keating v. Price 439. 444
Keel and Roberts v. Herbert 13
Keene d. Byron and others v. Deadon 124
Kelleran v. Brown 444
Kemble v. Rhinelander 250
Kennedy v. Lowry 155
——— v. Fairman 195
Kenny v. Van Horne 11. 211. 301. 338
Kibbe v. Kibbe 254
Kilburn v. Woodworth ib.
King v. Pippet 166
Kip v. Brigham and others 234. 293
Kirby v. Watkies 273

L

Ladd v. Blunt 290
Lady Ann Wardell 37
Laing v. United Ins. Co. 250
——— v. Bentham 260
Lamalore v. Caze 321
Lansing v. M'Killip 161
——— v. Gaine and Ten Eyck 306
Lanuse v. Barker 214
Larned v. Buffington 140
Lawrence v. Knies 161
——— v. Van Horne 211. 338
——— v. Ocean Ins. Co. 337. 338
Lee v. Tapscot 13. 188
Leech v. Armitage 218
Lenox v. United Ins. Co. 321
Lent v. Padelford 160
Leonard v. Vredenburgh 440
Levy v. Essex 34
——— v. Gadsby 127
Lewis v. Few 166. 216
——— v. Norton 195
———'s Lessee v. Stammers 222
——— v. Wildman 288
Little v. Lessee of Delancey 347
Livingston v. Kiersted and Heermance 14
——— et al. v. Swanwick 96. 159.
——— and Gilchrist v. Maryland Ins. Co. 301

Page
Livingston v. Rogers 347
Lockart v. Graham 361
Loften v. Heath 457
Lovell v. Arnold 234
Lowe v. Jolliffe 32
Luyten v. Haygood 58
Lynde v. Judd 103. 291. 340
Lynn v. Risberg 418

M

Mackay v. Rhinelander and others 94
Mageehan v. Lessee of Adams 427
Maigley v. Haner 46
Mallory v. Aspinwall 361
Manning, exparte 9
Manning v. Wheatland 34
Manny v. Harris 236
Marine Ins. Co. of Alexandria v. Stras 321
——————— v. Hodgson 433
Marshall v. Parker 249
Maryland Ins. Co. v. Ruden's Adm'r 443
Mason's Devisees v. Peters's Adm'rs 228
Mather v. Hood 260
Mauri v. Heffernan 348
M'Clenachan v. Scott 57
M'Dill's Lessee v. M'Dill 361
M'Ewen v. Gibbs et al. 51. 57
M'Kay v. Marine Ins. Co. 11
M'Lean and Wife v. Barnard 377
M'Leod v. Johnston 53
M'Minn v. Owen 424
M'Neil, exparte 5
M'Neaugh v. Goods 43
M'Williams v. Willis 161
Meade v. M'Dowelle 76
Meyer and another v. Barker 347
Middleton ads. Perry 427
Mifflin et al. v. Bingham 96. 199
Miles v. Dawson 12
—— v. O'Hara 200
Millar v. Heinrick 301
Miller v. Vaughan 288
——- v. Ireland 321
Mills and another v. Twist 363
Millward v. Hallett 53
Milward v. Temple 363
Monroe v. Twisleton 66
Moon v. Campbell 47
Moor v. Ames 226
Morgan v. Ins. Co. of North-America 321
Morris v. Miller 74
———'s Lessee v. Vanderen 79
——— and others v. Ross 288
Mostyn v. Fabrigas 165

Page
Mott and others v. Kip 76
—— v. Doughty 362
Mowatt v. Howland and others 306
Mumford v. Church 273
———— v. Hallett 423
Murray v. Wilson 56
Myers v. Kent 163

N

Nason v. Thatcher and others 47
Needham v. Smith 96
Neilson and others v. Columbian Ins. Co. 212
Nelius v. Brickell's Adm'r 363
Newby v. Read 153
Newburyport v. Boothbay 113
Newland v. Douglass 288
Newman v. Bradley 79
New-York Fireman Ins. Co. v. Walden 13
———— Ins. Co. v. Thomas 433
Nicholson's Lessee v. Mifflin 96
Nixon v. Long 321
Noble v. Smith and others 10
Norberg's Case 205
Norris v. Beach 6

O

O'Harra v. Hall 424
Oliphant v. Taggart 363
Overseers of Germantown v. Overseers of Livingston, 173
———————— New Berlin v. Overseers of Norwich 428
Owen v. Mann 49. 55

Page v. Woods 163
Paine v. M'Intier 424
Park v. Corkran and others 424
Parker v. Lovejoy 34
——— v. Hansen ib.
———'s Case 166
Parr v. Anderson 434
Patrick v. Ludlow 216
———- v. Hallett and Bowne ib.
Patton v. Caldwell 222
Pawling and others v. The United States 216
Paynes v. Coles and others 228
Pearl v. Allen 357
Pearson v. Pearson 433
Pease and another v. Morgan 161
Peck v. Woodbridge 226
Pegram v. Isbell 199. 234
Pelham (Lord) v. Pickersgill 124
Pennington v. Scott 11
Penrose v. Griffith 356
The People v. Anthony 157

A

TREATISE

ON THE

LAW OF EVIDENCE.

PART THE FIRST.

Plan of the work.

The arrangement, which has been adopted in the following treatise, is that which appeared the most simple and perspicuous. The work consists of two parts; the former, relating to parol or unwritten evidence; the latter, to written evidence. The subject of the first chapter is the method of compelling the attendance of witnesses for the purpose of being examined; and the five succeeding chapters treat of the causes, which render witnesses incompetent. In these, the writer has inquired into the several objections to witnesses, arising from want of reason or understanding, from defect of religious principle, from conviction of certain crimes or from infamy of character, from interest, and lastly that arising from the relation which subsists between a client and his counsel or his solicitor. After ascertaining whether the witness is competent to give evidence, the next question that arises, is, what evidence ought to be given, and how the witness ought to be examined. The seventh chapter, therefore, treats of the general nature of proofs; and the eighth, of the regular mode of

*2 examining a witness. And the first part *then concludes with an inquiry into bills of exception and demurrers to evidence.

The second part, which relates to written evidence, treats of records, of the admissibility of verdicts, and judgments, and other judicial proceedings, and of the manner in which they are to be regularly proved. Public writings, not of a judicial nature, and the inspection of such writings, are next considered; after which, follows an inquiry into the proof of private writings, the requisite of stamps on written instruments; and, lastly, into the admissibility of parol evidence by which written instruments may be explained or varied.

CHAP. I.

On the Attendance of Witnesses.

Attendance in civil cases.

THE process, which courts of law have instituted for the purpose of compelling the attendance of witnesses, is, the writ of subpœna ad testificandum (*a*). This writ commands the witness to appear at the trial to testify what he knows in the cause, under the penalty of 100l. to be forfeited to the king. And the stat. 5 Eliz. c. 9. s. 12. gives an additional remedy by enacting, that, "if any person (upon whom any process out of a court of record shall be served, to testify concerning any cause or matter depending there, and having tendered to him according to his countenance or calling such reasonable sum of money for his costs and charges, as with regard to the distance of

(*a*) A subpœna is not necessary, if the witness will appear without one, and in case of his voluntary attendance and examination, his expenses are to be allowed equally as if he had appeared on subpœna. *De Benneville* v. *De Benneville*, 1 *Binney* 46. *Bac. Abr. Evidence.* (D)

the place is necessary to be allowed,) do not appear according to the tenour of the process, not having a lawful and reasonable cause to the contrary; he shall forfeit for every such offence 10l., and yield such further recompense to the party grieved, as by the discretion of the judge of the court, out of which the process issues, shall be awarded (*b*)."

*No witness is bound to appear in civil cases, unless his reasonable expenses, for going to and returning from the *3

(*b*) The statute of the state of New-York, on this head, is as follows:—Each person served with process to testify in any court of record within this state, shall be entitled to receive as a compensation for his attendance and expenses of such court, the daily allowance specified in the act regulating the fees of the several officers and ministers of justice within this state; and if any person being subpœnaed, upon being tendered with the amount of the said allowance, estimating each day's travelling to, attending at, and returning from such court, computing thirty miles to a day's travelling, and including one day's attendance only, shall not thereupon appear according to the tenour of the said process, without a lawful and reasonable excuse, shall forfeit to the party grieved fifty dollars, and shall also yield further recompense to the party grieved according to the loss and hindrance sustained, to be recovered by action of debt in any court, with costs of suit. Sess. 36. c. 56. s. 20. 1 R. L. 524. The fees here alluded to are, for a witness attending in his county, twenty-five cents per day: and attending from a foreign county, and coming and returning, fifty cents per day. 2 R. L. 29. No fees for witnesses can be taxed, without proof by affidavit, of their attendance and travel. *Jackson d. Kincard* v. *Scott*, 6 *Johns. Rep.* 330. In Massachusetts, the certificate of the witness himself, as to his travel and attendance, is conclusive in taxing costs, unless something suspicious appear on the face of the certificate. *Cook* v. *Holmes*, 1 *Mass. Rep.* 295. In Connecticut, the usual process is by subpœna, signed by a justice of the peace or magistrate. When a witness has been thus summoned to appear, and his fees for travel and one day's attendance tendered to him, if he neglect to appear, the court will, on motion, issue a capias to take his body, and bring him before them to testify. *Swift's Ev.* 105.

trial, be tendered him at the time of serving the subpœna; nor, if he appears, is he bound to give evidence, till such charges are actually paid or tendered (1), except he reside within the bills of mortality, and be summoned to give evidence within them (2). The necessity of this previous tender arises from the special provision in the act of Elizabeth before cited.

If a necessary witness is brought over from a foreign country after the commencement of an action, and gives evidence at the trial, the reasonable expenses of his passage over, and of his subsistence here pending the action, will be allowed on the taxation of costs. This point was determined by the Court of Common Pleas in the case of Cotton v. Witt (3); in which case, it may be proper to observe, an application had been made to the opposite party for his consent to the examination of the witness on interrogatories, which had been refused. In the taxation of costs in that case, the expenses of the witness's return to his own country after the trial were not allowed. According to the report, little notice appears to have been taken of that point; and no reason seems to have been stated for making the distinction. The allowance of expenses in the case of foreign witnesses is from analogy to the common case of witnesses resident in this country; and there, on the taxation of costs, the expenses are allowed for the witness's return to his place of residence, as well as for his journey to the place of trial. And it should seem, from the reported opinion of the present Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas in the later case of Sturdy v. Andrews (4), that, when a witness is brought over from a foreign country *after* the commencement of an action, the expenses both of his
* 4 *coming to this country and of his return ought to be allowed in the taxation of costs. But such costs will not be allowed, if the witness has been brought over from abroad

(1) Chapman v. Poynton, 2 Stra. 1150. 13 East, 16. n. *a.* S. C. more fully stated. Bowles v. Johnson, 1 Blac. Rep. 36. Fuller v. Prentice, 1 H. Blac. 49.

(2) 3 Blac. Com. 369. Tidd. Prac. 805.

(3) 4 Taunt. 55.

(4) 4 Taunt. 699.

previous to the commencement of the action (1), or if the witness, being in the country, was detained here for the purposes of the trial (2); in those cases, the court will only allow the expenses for the witness's subsistence here during the action (*a*).

As only four witnesses can be included in one writ of subpœna (3), several writs are frequently necessary. In order to save expense, it is settled, that leaving a ticket, containing the substance of the writ, will be as effectual as the writ itself (*b*); but the writ ought to be shown (4). The writ or ticket should be served personally on the witness (5), and in reasonable time before the day of trial, that he may suffer the less inconvenience from his attendance on the court (6). Notice to a witness in London, at two in the afternoon, requiring him to attend the sittings at Westminster in the course of the same evening, has been held to be too short (7). If the witness, whose attendance is required, be a married woman, it will be necessary to serve the subpœna upon her personally, and the tender of the expenses should be made to her and not to her husband (8). If a cause appointed for one sitting be made a *remanet*, the subpœna must be re-sealed and re-served (9).

If a witness, who has been duly served with the writ, and has had a tender of the reasonable expenses, omits to at-

(1) Schimmel v. Lousada, 4 Taunt. 695.
(2) Sturdy v. Andrews, 4 Taunt. 697.
(3) Cowp. 846.
(4) Goodwin v. West, Cro. Car. 522. 540. Madison v. Shore, 5 Mod. 355. S. P.
(5) Smalt v. Whitmill, 2 Stra. 1054. Wakefield's case, Rep. temp. Hard. 313. S. P.
(6) Hammon v. Stewart, 1 Stra. 509.
(7) 2 Tidd. Pr. 807., 5th edit.
(8) Cro. El. 122. 1 Jon. 430. S. P.
(9) Sydenham v. Rand, 24. G. 3. K. B. cited from MS. in 2 Tidd. Pr. 806.

(*a*) The Supreme Court of the state of New-York has decided, that where witnesses are brought from another state, the time of their attendance can only be computed from the place of trial, coming and returning, to the boundary line of the state. *Howland & others* v. *Lenox & Maitland*, 4 *Johns. Rep.* 311.

(*b*) A subpœna ticket to appear at a term of the Supreme Court, not mentioning the place where the court was to be held, was adjudged to be sufficient. *The People* v. *Van Wyck*, 2 *Caines' Rep.* 333.

tend at the trial without a sufficient cause, he is liable to be proceeded against in one of three ways: 1. By attachment,
* 5 *for a contempt of the process of the court (1); 2. By a special action on the case for damages, at common law (2); 3. By an action on the stat. 5 Eliz. c. 9. s. 12. for the penalty of 10l., and also for the further recompense recoverable under that statute. This action for a further recompense will not lie, unless the amount has been previously assessed by the court out of which the process issued: neither the jury nor the judge at nisi prius being competent to make the assessment (3). When the assessment has been made, an action of debt will lie. But the more usual way is to proceed by attachment. And in order to ground this summary way of proceeding, it is not only necessary to show an ill motive in the witness, or negligence and inattention to the process of the court, but also to prove that the witness was personally served (4), and that his reasonable expenses were paid or tendered at the time of the service of the subpœna (5).

It has been laid down, that it is not the practice of the Court of Common Pleas to grant an attachment against a witness for non-attendance, but that they leave the party injured to his remedy at law (6). However several cases (7), in which the court has refused an attachment under special circumstances, seem to show that the general rule is the same in the Common Pleas as in the Court of King's Bench.

The witnesses, as well as the parties in the suit, are protected by courts of justice, and privileged from arrest (*a*),

(1) 1 Stra. 510. 2 Stra. 810.1054. 1150. Cowp. 846. Doug. 561.
(2) Pearson v. Iles, Doug. 561.
(3) Ib. See ante, p. 2.
(4) 2 Stra. 1054.
(5) Ante, p. 2.
(6) Per Wright, J. in Ryder v. Fletcher, cited 13 East, 16. Huffe v. Fowke, Barnes, 33.
(7) Brodie v. Tichel, Barn. 35. Stretch v. Wheeler, do. 497. Fuller v. Prentice, 1 H. Bl. 49. Blanford v. Detastet, 5 Taunt. 260.

(*a*) A witness or party coming from another place than that in which the court sits, is protected while at his lodgings, as well as when going to, or returning from court. *Hurst's case*, 4 *Dall.* 387.

eundo morando et redeundo (8). And in ordinary cases it is not necessary for the protection of a witness, that he should have been served with a subpœna (*b*), if upon application to him he *consented to attend without one (1). A reasonable time is allowed to the witness for going and returning; and, in making the allowance, the courts are disposed to be liberal (2). This privilege has been extended to a party in the suit attending an arbitrator under an order of nisi prius (3). And so a bankrupt, attending a meeting of commissioners in pursuance of a notice, is during his attendance protected from arrest at the suit of a creditor (4), the commissioners being assembled under the authority of an act of parliament, and sitting as a court for the administration of Justice (*b*). *6

Commissioners of bankrupt, by stat. 1 J. 1. c. 15. s. 15. are empowered to issue their warrant and apprehend persons, who, after a sufficient warning given to them, refuse to come and appear before them to be examined, not having any lawful impediment for such refusal. And by

(8) Lightfoot v. Cameron, 2 Blac. Rep. 1113.

(1) Ld. Kenyon, C. J. in Arding v. Flower, 8 T. R. 536.

(2) 2 Blac. Rep. 1113. Hatch v. Blisset, Gilb. Cas. 308, cited 2 Stra. 986. 13 East, 16. n. (a).

(3) Spence v. Stuart, 3 East, 89.

(4) Arding v. Flower, 8 T. R. 534. 2 Blac. Rep. 1142. Kinder v. Williams, 4 T. R. 377. Spence v. Stuart, 3 East, 89. Ex parte Byne, 1 Ves. & Beam. 316.

(*b*) But it has been held, in Massachusetts, that a witness attending without process is not privileged from arrest. *Ex parte M'Neil*, 6 *Mass. Rep.* 264.

(*a*) So, a witness attending from another state to prove a will in the Supreme Court of the state of New-York, was held to be privileged. *Norris* v. *Beach*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 294. So, a witness attending at the general Sessions of the peace under a recognizance. *Bours* v. *Tuckerman*, 7 *Johns. Rep.* 538. But notice must be given to the plaintiff of the intended application to the court to be discharged. *Grover* v. *Green*, 1 *Caines' Rep.* 115. The privilege does not extend throughout the term at which the cause is marked for trial; nor will it protect the witness while he is engaged in transacting his general private business, after he is discharged from the obligation of his subpœna. *Smythe* v. *Banks*, 4 *Dall.* 329.

section 11. of the same act, witnesses sent for by the commissioners shall have such costs and charges as the commissioners shall think fit. It has been determined, that it is not necessary, under this section, to tender a witness, at the time of summoning him, the expenses of his journey; although, if he be in fact without the means of taking the journey, it may be an excuse for not obeying the summons (5). The necessity of a previous tender of expenses, in the case of a witness who is subpœnaed to attend at a trial, arises from the special provision of the stat. 5 Eliz. c. 9. s. 12.

By the stat. 5 G. 2. c. 30. s. 6. it is enacted, that, in case a bankrupt is in execution or cannot be brought before the commissioners, the acting commissioners shall attend the bankrupt and take his discovery: but as this attendance on
* 7 *the bankrupt in prison has been found to be extremely inconvenient, it is now provided by stat. 49 G. 3. c. 121. s. 13. that bankrupts charged in execution are to be brought before the commissioners to be examined by them, in the same manner as bankrupts in custody on mesne process: and the warrant of the commissioners is an indemnity to the keeper of the prison.

The general enclosure act, stat. 41 G. 3. c. 109. s. 33, 34. gives commissioners a power to summon in writing any person within a certain distance to appear before them and to be examined, and subjects them to a penalty, in case they refuse to appear.

Attendance in criminal cases.

The means of compelling the attendance of witnesses, in criminal cases, are of two kinds (1): first, By process of subpœna; or, secondly, the justice or coroner, who takes the information of the witnesses, may, at the time of taking it, or at any time before the trial, bind them over to appear, and, if they refuse to come or be bound over, may commit them for a contempt: and this is the ordinary and more effectual method.

In prosecutions for misdemeanors the defendant has been from the earliest times allowed the writ of subpœna: but

(5) Battye v. Gresley, 8 East, 318. (1) 2 Hale P. C. 281.

prisoners had no right, by the common law, to this process in capital cases (2), without the special order of the court. Formerly a prisoner was put upon his trial under a twofold disadvantage; he was unable to compel the attendance of witnesses, and, if they voluntarily attended, their evidence, not being given on oath, met with less credit than the evidence on the part of the prosecution. But by stat. 7 W. 3. c. s. 7., all persons indicted for any high treason, whereby corruption of blood may ensue, shall have the like process of the court, where they shall be tried, to compel their witnesses to appear for them, as is usually granted to compel *witnesses to appear against them (*a*). And now, as the * 8
stat. 1 Ann. st. 1. c. 9. s. 3. enacts, that all witnesses on behalf of a prisoner, on a trial for treason or felony, shall be sworn in the same manner as witnesses for the crown, and be liable to all the penalties of perjury, process may be taken out against them in any case whatever (1).

In order to provide for the appearance of witnesses, to answer in cases where warrants are not usually issued, and to give evidence in criminal prosecutions in any part of the United Kingdom, it is enacted by a late act of parliament, stat. 45 G. 3. c. 92. s. 3., that the service of a writ of subpœna or other process in any part of the United Kingdom shall be as effectual to compel his appearance in any other part, as if the same had been served in that part where the person is required to appear. And if the person served

(2) 2 Hawk. P. C. 46. s. 17. (1) 2 Hawk. P. C. c. 46. s. 17.

(*a*) See the statutes of the state of New-York, by which process for witnesses is allowed the prisoner in treason; sess. 24. c. 29. s. 4. 1 R. L. 145. and in felony, sess. 36. c. 8. s. 11. 1 R. L. 496. And see Laws U. S. act of April 30, 1790, sect. 29. to the same effect. In South Carolina, it has been held that the defendant to an indictment was entitled to subpœnas to compel the attendance of witnesses, after the trial, to make affidavit of extenuating circumstances, to be submitted to the court in order to lessen the degree of punishment. *The State* v. *Smith and Cameron, 2 Bay,* 62.

does not appear, the court, out of which the process issued, may transmit a certificate of the default in the manner specified by the act, and the court to which the certificate is transmitted may punish the person for his default, as if he had refused to appear to process issuing out of that court (*b*).

Compensation.

In civil proceedings, as we have seen, a witness is not obliged to attend, unless his expenses are duly tendered; but, in criminal prosecutions, the demands of public justice supersede every consideration of private inconvenience, and witnesses are unconditionally bound to appear. On the other hand, it is reasonable and highly expedient, that, when they attend on behalf of the public, a fair compensation should be given them for their trouble and necessary expense. Formerly, however, the law provided no means for reimbursing them; a defect in our judicial administration, which was at length remedied by stat. 27 G. 2. c. 3. s. 3. This statute enacts, that "when any poor person shall appear on recognizance to give evidence against another accused of grand or petit larceny or other felony, *the court may on the oath of such person, and on consideration of his circumstances, in open court order the treasurer of the county or place, in which the offence shall have been committed, to pay such sum of money, as to the court shall seem reasonable, for his time, trouble, and expense." As this statute extended only to poor persons who appeared on recognizance, and not to such as appeared on subpœna to give evidence, it was afterwards deemed reasonable by the legislature, that every person so appearing on recognizance or subpœna should be allowed his reasonable expenses, and also, in case of poverty, a satisfaction for his trouble and loss of time. The stat. 18 G. 3. c. 19. s. 8. therefore enacts that "where any person shall

* 9

(*b*) In the state of New-York, the courts of common pleas and of general sessions of the peace may issue subpœnas into any part of the state, under the like penalties as if the witness were within the jurisdiction of the court. Sess. 36. c. 65. s. 10. 2 R. L. 147.

appear on recognizance or subpœna to give evidence as to any grand or petit larceny or other felony, whether any bill or indictment be preferred or not to the grand jury, it shall be in the power of the court (provided the person shall, in the opinion of the court, have *bona fide* attended in obedience to such recognizance or subpœna,) to order the treasurer of the county or division, in which the offence shall have been committed, to pay him such sum as to the court shall seem reasonable, not exceeding the expenses which it shall appear to the court the said person was *bona fide* put unto, by reason of the said recognizance and subpœna, making a reasonable allowance, in case he shall appear to be in poor circumstances, for trouble and loss of time (*a*)."

Witness on ship-board or in custody.

In some cases a subpœna can have no effect, as where the witness is in custody, or on board of a ship under the command of an officer, who refuses to allow his attendance. The course then is to sue out a writ of habeas corpus ad testificandum; for which purpose application ought to be made to the court or judge, upon affidavit of the party applying, stating that he is a material witness (1); and, in case of his being on board a ship, that he is willing to attend (2), (*b*). Upon this application the court in its dis-

(1) Layer's case, Fortesc. 396. (1) Roddam's case, Cowp. 672.

(*a*) So, in the state of New-York, poor witnesses appearing on recognizance to give evidence against another accused of any larceny or other felony, may, by order of the court to the treasurer of the city or county in which the offence was committed, be compensated for their time, trouble, and expense; and witnesses attending at the request of the public prosecutor, from a foreign state, to give evidence in any criminal prosecution, are allowed such sum of money, as to the court shall appear reasonable, for their time, trouble, and expense. Sess. 36. c. 8. s. 16. 1 R. L. 498. The act has been construed to extend to poor persons appearing on subpœna. *The People* v. *Dowelle Coleman*, 41. But it only applies to such as are poor, and not to those who are able to bear their own expenses. *Ex parte Manning*, 1 *Caines' Rep.* 59.

(*b*) Whether the witness should not have been previously served with a subpœna? *Quære. R.* v. *Roddam, Cowp.* 672.

cretion *will make a rule, or the judge will grant his fiat for a writ (1), which is then sued out, signed and sealed (2). The writ should be left with the sheriff or other officer, who will then be bound to bring up the body, on being paid his reasonable charges (*a*). If the witness be a prisoner of war, he may be examined by consent on interrogatories, but cannot be brought up without an order from the secretary of state (3).

It has been doubted whether persons in custody could be brought up as witnesses by writ of habeas corpus to give evidence before any other courts except those at Westminster; but now by stat. 43 G. 3. c. 140. it is enacted that a judge of either of the courts may, at his discretion, award such writ for bringing a prisoner, detained in any jail in England, before a court martial, or before commissioners of bankrupt, commissioners for auditing the public accounts, or other commissioners acting by virtue of any royal commission or warrant.

Witness abroad.

When a material witness resides abroad, or is going abroad, and cannot attend at the trial, the party requiring his testimony may move the court in term time, or may apply to a judge in vacation for a rule or order to have him examined on interrogatories *de bene esse* before one of the judges of the court (*b*), if the witness reside in town, or if he reside in the country or abroad, before commissioners specially appointed and approved by the opposite party (4). The rule or order for such examination, which is only secondary evidence, cannot be obtained without the consent of both parties. And, though the court cannot compel the other party to consent, yet, if necessary, it will assist the party applying, by putting off the trial, (that there may be an opportunity of filing a bill in equity,) until the consent is obtained, or the witness returns: and if, after

(1) Burbage's case, 3 Burr. 1440.
(2) Tidd. Pr. 739.
(3) Furly v. Newnham, 2 Doug. 419.
(4) 2 Tidd. Pr. 812.

(*a*) *Noble* v. *Smith and others*, 5 *Johns. Rep.* 357.
(*b*) Post, 272, 273.

all, the *defendant should refuse, the court will not give him judgment as in case of a nonsuit (1).

When a party, after obtaining leave by consent, examines witnesses abroad on depositions, he will not be entitled to any allowance in the taxation of costs for the expense of taking the depositions, although he may proceed in the action (2). The same rule prevails in the court of chancery: if a party applies to that court for a commission to examine witnesses, he must pay the expenses (*a*).

Before the court will consent to put off the trial on account of the absence of a material witness, it requires to be satisfied, that justice would be done by refusing the application, and that the party who makes the application has not conducted himself unfairly, nor been the cause of any improper delay (3). The rule will not be granted where the testimony of the witness is intended to set up an odious defence, (as, that the plaintiff is slave to the defendant, and therefore could not recover in the action, or that he is an alien enemy,(4) &c.): nor will it grant the rule for the purpose of giving the defendant an opportunity, which he has once lost by his own neglect, of applying to a court of equity (*b*) for a commission (5).

(1) Furly v. Newnham, 2 Doug. 419. Mostyn v. Fabrigas, Cowp. 174. Calliard v. Vaughan, 1 Bos. & Pull. 211.

(2) Stephens v. Crichton, 2 East, 259. Taylor v. Roy. Ex. Ass. Comp., 8 East, 393.

(3) Saunders v. Pitman, 1 Bos. & Pull. 33.

(4) Robinson v. Smyth, 1 Bos. & Pull. 454.

(5) Calliard v. Vaughan, 1 Bos. & Pull. 212.

(*a*) In the state of New-York, the expenses of *executing* a commission are not taxable, but the party will be allowed the costs of *suing it out.* *Kenny* v. *Van Horne*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 107.

(*b*) The absence of a witness whom the party might have examined de bene esse, is no cause for putting off the trial. *M'Kay* v. *Marine Ins. Co.* 2 *Caines' Rep.* 384. As to the practice relative to putting off trials on account of the absence of a material witness, vide *Rex* v. *Le Chevalier D'Eon*, 3 *Burr.* 1513. S. C. 1 *W. Black.* 510. 1 *Sellon's Practice*, 418, 419, 420. *Schlosser* v. *Lesher*, 1 *Dall.* 251. *Bowen* v. *Douglas*, 2 *Dall.* 44. *Pennington* v. *Scott*,

Where a cause of action has arisen in India, or any offence has been committed there, which is tried in this country, the evidence of witnesses resident in India may be obtained in the manner prescribed by stat. 13 G. 3. c. 63. s. 40. and s. 44.

Subpœna duces tecum.

* 12

If a witness has in his possession any deeds or writings, which are thought necessary at the trial, a special clause must be inserted in the subpœna, called a *duces tecum*, commanding him to bring them with him. When the writings are in possession of the adverse party or his attorney, notice should be given to produce them, and if after proof of a reasonable notice they are refused, secondary evidence of the contents will be admitted (*a*). It is not necessary to give notice to the defendant himself: giving it to his attorney will be sufficient, even in penal actions (1.)

This writ of subpœna *duces tecum*, as well as the other writ of subpœna *ad testificandum*, is compulsory upon the witness. And though it will be a question for the consideration of the judge at the trial, whether in any particular case the actual production of writings should be enforced, yet the witness ought always to have them ready to be produced, if required, in obedience to the judicial mandate (2). From the earliest times, our courts of common law, in order to give effect to their proceedings, have resorted to these compulsory measures for the production of evidence, measures obviously essential to the existence and constitution of courts of justice (*b*).

(1) Attorney-General v. Le Merchant, 2 T. R. 203. n. Cates q. t. v. Winter, 3 T. R. 306.

(2) Amey v. Long, 9 East, 485.

---

ibid. 94. *White* v. *Lynch*, *ibid.* 183. *Symes's Lessee* v. *Irvine*, *ibid.* 383. *Davidson* v. *Brown*, 4 *Binney*, 243. *Commonwealth* v. *Millard*, 1 *Mass. Rep.* 6. *Smith* v. *Barker*, 3 *Day*, 280. *Anonymous*, *ibid.* 308. *The United States* v. *Frink*, 4 *Day*, 471.

(*a*) *Post*, 336—343.

(*b*) In a nisi prius case, Lord Kenyon ruled, that the court could not compel a witness, who had been served with a subpœna *duces tecum*, to produce a private paper. *Miles* v. *Dawson*, 1 *Esp.* 405.

*CHAP. II.

Of the Incompetency of Witnesses from Want of Understanding.

When a witness appears, he must be regularly sworn, unless an objection is made to his competency. An exception to the *credibility* of a witness cannot exclude him from being sworn. The exception of kindred, for example, although it is a good cause of challenge against a juror, is not an objection to the competency of a witness; a father is a competent witness for or against his son, and a master for his servant, or the servant for his master. Such exceptions may affect the credibility, but they do not affect the competency of witnesses.

As it is the province of the jury to consider what degree of credit ought to be given to evidence, so it is for the court alone to determine whether a witness is competent, or the evidence admissible. Whether there is *any* evidence, is a question for the judge: whether it is *sufficient* (*a*), is for the jury (1). And whatever antecedent facts are necessary to

(1) Per Buller J., Comp. of Carpenters, &c. v. Hayward, Doug. 375. Bull. N. P. 297.

However, Lord Ellenborough considers that case as establishing in principle nothing more than this, that there are circumstances in respect of which the production of an instrument, required in the terms of a *subpœna*, would not be enforced by the authority of the court. *Amey* v. *Long*, 9 *East*, 485.

(*a*) Vide *Wills* v. *Tucker*, 3 *Binney*, 370. 372, 373. *Hardaway* v. *Manson*, 2 *Mun.* 230. *Shanks & M'Rae* v. *Fenwick*, *Ibid.* 487. 1 *Wash.* 90. The rule, that it is the province of the jury alone to decide on the sufficiency of the evidence, has, in Virginia, been carried to the extent of prohibiting the Court from instructing, or giving an opinion to, the jury, on the sufficiency of the evidence. *Fisher's Ex'r.* v. *Duncan & Turnbull*, 1 *Hen. & Mun.* 563. *Keel & Roberts* v. *Herbert*, 1 *Wash.* 203. When, however, the judge does give an opinion to the jury on a matter of fact, it should be

be ascertained, for the purpose of deciding the question of competency, as, for example, whether a child understands the nature of an oath—or, whether the confession of a prisoner was voluntary—or, whether declarations, offered in evidence as dying declarations, were made under the immediate apprehension of death: these, and other facts of the same kind, are to be determined by the court, and not by the jury.

By the law of England the objections to the competency of witnesses are fourfold. The first ground of incompe-
*14 tency is want of reason or understanding: a second *ground is defect of religious principle: a third ground arises from conviction of certain crimes, or from infamy of character: the fourth and most general cause of incompetency is interest. Either of these grounds of incompetency will exclude the witness from giving any kind of evidence. "I find no rule less comprehensive than this," said Mr. Justice Lawrence, in the case of Jordaine v. Lashbrooke (1), "that all persons are admissible witnesses, who have the use of their reason, and such religious belief as to feel the obligation of an oath, who have not been convicted of any infamous crime, and who are not influenced by interest."

(1) 7 T. R. 610.

---

by way of advice, and not of positive direction, as on a question of law. *New-York Firemen Ins. Co.* v. *Walden*, 12 *Johns. Rep.* 513. Illegal or improper evidence, (however unimportant it may be to the cause,) ought never to be confided to the jury; for if it should have an influence upon their minds, it will mislead them; and if it should have none, it is useless and may at least produce perplexity. *Lee* v. *Tapscott*, 2 *Wash.* 276. *Brown & Boisseau* v. *May*, 1 *Mun.* 291. The character of witnesses and the credit which is due to them, are subjects peculiarly within the province of the jury; and where the verdict has depended on these points, the court has always refused to interfere, except in extraordinary cases. *Lessee of Fehl* v. *Good and another*, 2 *Binney*, 495. *Rogers* v. *Briley*, 1 *Hayw.* 256.

An inquiry into these several causes of incompetency forms the subject of the four following chapters.

First, as to incompetency for want of understanding.

Persons, who have not the use of reason, are from their infirmity utterly incapable of giving evidence: as persons insane, idiots, and lunatics (*a*) under the influence of their malady (2). But lunatics and other persons, who are subject to temporary fits of insanity, may be witnesses in their lucid intervals, if they have sufficiently recovered their understandings (3). And a person born deaf and dumb is not on that account incompetent, but, if he has sufficient understanding, may give evidence by signs with the assistance of an interpreter (4).

Children.

A witness must not only have a competent share of reason, but also know the nature of an oath: children, therefore, who are not able to understand its moral obligation, cannot be examined (5). There seems to be no precise age fixed, at which infants are excluded from being *witnesses. At one time, indeed, their age was considered as the criterion of their competency; and it was a general rule, that none could be admitted under the age of nine years, very few under ten (1); which was in some measure denying them the protection of law against secret acts of violence (2). A more reasonable rule has been since adopted; and the admissibility of children is now regulated not by their age, but by their apparent sense and understanding (*b*). In Brazier's case, on an indictment for

* 15

(2) Co. Lit. 6. *b.* 6 Com. Dig. tit. "Testmoigne," A. 1.
(3) Com. Dig. Ib.
(4) Ruston's case, 1 Leach Cr. C. 455.
(5) Com. Dig. Ib. Bull. N. P. 293. Gilb. Ev. 130.
(1) R. v. Travers, 2 Stra. 700; and cases in East, P. C. 442. S. P. 1 Hal. P. C. 302. 2 Hal. P. C. 278.
(2) Bull. N. P. 293.

(*a*) Evidence may be admitted to show the incompetency of such person when offered as a witness. *Livingston* v. *Kiersted & Heermance*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 362.

(*b*) *The King* v. *Rose Kelly*, 1 *Mac Nally*, 154. *Swift's Ev.* 46. *Commonwealth* v. *Hutchinson*, 10 *Mass. Rep.* 215. The credit of the witness, which is greatly impaired by his age, is to

assaulting an infant of five years of age with intent to ravish her, it was agreed by all the judges, that children of any age might be examined on oath, if capable of distinguishing between good and evil: but that they cannot be examined, in any case, without oath (3). This is now the established rule in all cases, criminal as well as civil, and whether the prisoner is tried for a capital offence, or for one of an inferior nature. When the child has appeared not sufficiently to understand the nature and obligation of an oath, judges have often thought it necessary, for the purposes of justice, to put off the trial of the prisoner, directing that the child, in the mean time, should be properly instructed (*b*).

If a child is too young to be sworn, it follows as a necessary consequence, that any account, which it may have given others, ought not to be admitted. On an indictment, therefore, for a rape on a child five years old, where the child was not examined, but an account of what she had told her mother about three weeks after the transaction, was given in evidence by the mother, and the jury convicted the prisoner, principally, as was supposed, on that evidence: the judges, on a case reserved for their opinion, thought the evidence clearly inadmissible, and the prisoner was accordingly pardoned (4).

* 16 *When the evidence of children is admitted, says Mr. Justice Blackstone (1), it is much to be wished, in order to render their evidence credible, that there should be some

(3) Brazier's case, 1779, 1 East P. C. 443,4. Bull. N. P. 293. 1 Leach Cr. C. 237. 4 Blac. Com. 214.

(4) R. v. Tucker, 1808. MS. See also R. v. Brazier, supra.

(1) 4 Com. 214.

---

be judged of by the jury from the manner of his testifying and other circumstances. *Commonwealth* v. *Hutchinson*, *Ubi. Sup.*

(*b*) *Bac. Abr. tit. Evidence*, 577. *in notis*, 2 *Leach*, 482 *n.* The same course was pursued in the case of *The King* v. *White*, 2 *Leach*, 482, where the witness, who is not stated in the report to have been under years of discretion, was altogether ignorant of the obligation of an oath, and of the existence of a future state.

concurrent testimony of time, place, and circumstances, in order to make out the fact; and that the conviction should not be grounded singly on the unsupported accusation of an infant under years of discretion. It seems, however, impossible to lay down any general rule on this subject, applicable to all cases. A prisoner may be legally convicted on such evidence, alone, and unsupported; and whether the account of the witness requires to be corroborated in any part, or to what extent, is a question exclusively for the jury, to be determined by them on a review of all the circumstances of the case, and especially of the manner in which the child has given his evidence. The evidence may be so circumstantial, so plain and clear, and so free from all mixture of partiality and ill will, as to leave no reasonable doubt of the prisoner's guilt, although it stands unsupported by other witnesses (*a*).

(*a*) It is said, that it is not a legal exception to a witness, that he is an alien, a villein, or a bondman, 1 *Mac Nally*, 156. But in a case in Pennsylvania, it was said by M'Kean, Ch. J. that it was a settled point at common law, that a slave could not be a witness, because of the unbounded influence of his master over him; which was, at least, equal to duress: and that it would be difficult to administer an oath to a slave, for want of knowing any religion he professed, 4 *Dall.* 145 *n.* (1). In the State of New-York, (by statute) no slave can be a witness in any case, except for or against another slave in criminal cases. Sess. 36. c. 88. s. 19. 2 R. L. 207. But a free black man is a competent witness to prove facts which may have happened while he was a slave. *Gurney* v. *Dessies*, 1 *Johns. Rep.* 508. A manumission of a slave by an infant, although voidable, renders the slave, until revocation, a competent witness for his former master: the power of the infant to revoke the gift, on coming of age, being an objection to his credit only. *Rogers' Ex'rs.* v. *Berry*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 132.

CHAP. III.

Of Incompetency from Defect of Religious Principle.

The second ground of incompetency, which has been mentioned, is defect of religious principle.

All witnesses before they are examined, are required to take an oath, by which they appeal to the Supreme Being for the truth of the evidence which they are about to give. This necessarily implies a belief, that, by the laws of God, truth is enjoined, and falsehood punished. It is not sufficient, that a witness believes himself bound to speak truth from a regard to character or the common interests of so-
* 17 *ciety, or from fear of punishment (1). Such motives have indeed their influence, and may come in aid of the religious obligation, but they are of a nature so capricious and infirm, and so liable to be perverted, as to afford little or no security for the observance of truth. Our law, therefore, like that of most other civilized countries, requires a witness to believe, that there is a God and a future state of reward and punishment, and that by taking the oath he imprecates the divine vengeance upon himself, if his evidence shall be false (2).

Atheists, &c. Atheists, and such infidels as profess not any religion, that can bind their consciences to speak the truth, are excluded from being witnesses (3). Lord Coke, indeed, says generally, that an *infidel* cannot be a witness (4), in which denomination he intended to comprise Jews as well as Heathens (5): and Mr. Serjeant Hawkins thought it a sufficient objection to the competency of a witness, that he believed neither the Old nor the New Testament (6). Lord Hale,

(1) Ruston's case, 1 Leach Cr. C. 455.

(2) White's case, Leach Cr. C. 482. 1 Atk. Rep. 19. 48.

(3) Bull. N. P. 292. 1 Atk. 40. 45. 48. Gilb. Ev. 129.

(4) Co. Lit. 6. *b*.

(5) 2 Inst. 506. 3 Inst. 165. 1 Atk. 43. Willes 541.

(6) Hawk. P. C. b. 2. c. 46. s. 148.

however, was of a different opinion, and strongly points out the unreasonableness of excluding indiscriminately all Heathens from giving evidence, as well as the inconsistency of compelling them to swear in a form which they may possibly not consider binding. "It were a very hard case, he says, if a murder, committed here in presence only of a Turk or a Jew, should be dispunishable, because such an oath should not be taken, which the witness holds binding, and cannot swear otherwise, and possibly might think himself under no obligation, if sworn according to the usual style of the courts of England (7)." All doubts upon this subject, however, are now removed. In the case of Omichund and Barker, (which came before Lord Chancellor Hardwicke, assisted by Lee, C. J., Willes, C. J., and Parker, C. B.,) *it was solemnly decided, that the depositions of witnesses professing the Gentoo religion, who had been sworn according to the ceremonies of their religion under a commission out of Chancery, ought to be admitted in evidence (1). And it may now be considered as an established rule, that infidels of any other country, who believe in a God, the avenger of falsehood, ought to be received here as witnesses: but infidels, who believe not that there is a God or a future state of rewards and punishments (*a*), * 13

(7) 2 Hale P. C. 279.
(1) Omichund and Barker, 1 Atk. 21. 1 Wils. 84. S. C. Willes 538. S. C.

(*a*) It has been decided in the Supreme Court of Connecticut, that every person who does not believe in the obligation of an oath, and a future state of rewards and punishments, or any accountability after death for his conduct, is by law excluded from being a witness; for to such a person the law presumes no credit is to be given. Testimony is not to be received from any person in a court of justice, but under the sanction of an oath. It would therefore be idle to administer an oath to a man who disregards its obligation. And every person who believes in the obligation of an oath, whatever may be his religious creed, whether *Christian*, *Mahommedan*, or *Pagan*, or whether he disbelieves them all, is an admissible witness; and may testify in a court of justice, being sworn according to that form of oath, which, according to his

cannot be admitted in any case (2). It follows, that, for the purpose of trying the competency of a witness, the proper question is, not as to his particular opinions, as, whether he believes in Jesus Christ, or in the gospels, but

(2) Willes, 549. 1 Atk. 45. Fachina v. Sabine, Stra. 1104. Morgan's case, Leach Cr. C. 64.

---

creed, he holds to be obligatory. *Curtiss* v. *Strong*, 4 *Day*, 51. S. C. *Swift's Ev*. 48. In the case cited it was made a question whether the incompetency of the witness could be proved from his declarations out of court concerning his opinions and principles:—the question was decided in the affirmative; and it was also decided, that the witness could not be admitted to deny or explain in court the declarations imputed to him, as it would be incongruous to admit a man to his oath for the purpose of learning from him whether he had the necessary qualifications to be sworn. Upon this case Judge Swift, in his *Law of Evidence*, makes the following remarks:—If a case can be supposed where a man has such a sense of the moral obligation to speak the truth at all times, that he will, from a regard to it, acknowledge that he disbelieves the religious obligation of an oath, he would, by that circumstance, be entitled to credit; and the consequence of this mode of inquiry would be, where it had any effect, that the most unprincipled men, who ought not to be credited, would never be excluded by it; and that none but those would be excluded who had such a high sense of the moral obligation to speak the truth, that they might safely be relied on. But to this mode of drawing out the private opinions of men, there are other very serious objections. A man's opinions are matters between himself and his God, so long as he does not disclose them, and it is wholly inconsistent with the rights of conscience, to compel him to do it. It is a first principle that no man is bound to testify facts that criminate him, or that tend to disgrace, degrade, or disparage him. If to say that a witness does not believe in the existence of a God, and the obligation of an oath does not criminate him, it will certainly be acknowleged that it tends deeply to his disgrace, degradation, and disparagement: he would therefore be under an irresistable temptation to answer such questions in a manner favourable to his character. Such answer would be deemed no evidence in itself of the truth of the fact; and it would be unreasonable to expose a man to such a temptation to prevarication. It is true in England,

whether he believes in the existence of a God and a future state. For this reason, in a case before Mr. Justice Buller, where a witness, who had been sworn on the gospels, was asked, whether he believed in the gospels on which he had been sworn, the question was objected to, and overruled by the court (3). This question appears to have been put *after the swearing in chief*, though before the examination of the witness. If it had been asked before the witness was sworn, it seems that it would have been regular; for if he had not believed in the gospels, how could he have been sworn upon them? The administration of an oath in such a case would be merely nugatory; and evidence would be given without any religious sanction, on the bare assertion of a witness. If the law requires an oath, and a witness believes not in any form of religion, the consequence seems to be that he cannot be sworn (4).

Excommunication.

It has been frequently laid down, that persons excommunicated are not competent witnesses, because it is supposed, that those who have been excluded from the church *are not under the influence of any religion. The authority, generally referred to in support of this rule, is a dictum of Lord Coke, C. J. in the case of the Attorney

* 19

(3) R. v. Taylor, Peake's N. P. C. 11.

(4) A Tract has been written on this subject by Mr. Baron Smith, one of the Barons of the Court of Exchequer in Ireland.

---

in modern times, there have been a few instances, where inquiries of this sort have been made of witnesses; but a practice so directly repugnant to principle, ought not to be deemed a precedent here. *Swift's Ev.* 49, 50.—Mr. Christian, in a note on 3 *Black. Com.* 369, observes, that he has known a witness rejected and hissed out of court, who declared that he doubted of the existence of a God, and a future state; but he adds,—"I have since heard a learned judge declare at nisi prius, that the judges had resolved not to permit adult witnesses to be interrogated respecting their belief of the Deity and of a future state. It is probably more conducive to the course of justice that this should be presumed till the contrary is proved. And the most religious witness may be scandalized by the imputation, which the very question conveys."

General v. Griffith (1), concerning the oath of allegiance required of Popish recusants. He is there reported to have said, "by the stat. 3 J. 1. c. 5. every recusant convict is to be excommunicated; and therefore on my circuit, I do not admit of them for witnesses between party and party, they being not competent witnesses." On the authority of this dictum, the rule has been commonly adopted by writers on the subject of evidence; although the reason, upon which it is supposed to have been founded, would in the present day be generally exploded. But now, by a late act of the legislature, this objection has been entirely removed. The stat. 53 G. 3. c. 127. § 2, 3. enacts that no sentence of excommunication shall be pronounced by Ecclesiastical Courts in cases of contempt or disobedience to their order, and that persons excommunicated shall in no case incur any civil penalty or disability.

With regard to the ceremony or form of administering an oath, that form is obviously the best, which most clearly conveys the meaning of the oath, and most forcibly impresses its obligation. And since this is not an essential part of the oath, but entirely of human institution, and has varied in different times and countries, though the substance of the oath must be the same in all, it is obviously necessary to allow men to swear according to the peculiar ceremony of their religion, that is, in the manner which they consider most binding on their conscience. "Possibly, says Lord Hale, they may not think themselves under any obligation, if sworn according to the usual style in the courts of England (2)." Jews have therefore been sworn in our courts from the earliest times on the Pentateuch (3); and no distinction appears ever to have been taken between their swearing in a civil or in a criminal case. In an old case,
* 20 *where a witness refused to be sworn in the usual form, by laying his right hand on the book and kissing it afterwards, Glin, C. J. ruled, that he might be sworn, by having the

(1) 2 Bulstr. 155.
(2) 2 H. P. C. 279. 1 Atk. 42. 48.
(3) 1 Atk. 40. 42. Willes 543. Cowp. 389.

book laid open before him and holding up his right hand (1). "In my opinion, said the Chief Justice, he has taken as strong an oath as any other witness." So on the trial of some of the rebels at Carlisle in the year 1745, a witness being sworn in the same manner by holding up his hand, the point was referred to the judges for their opinion, and they all agreed in thinking the witness legally sworn (2). Mahometans may be sworn on the Koran (3); and Gentoos, and upon the same principle all persons, according to the ceremonies of their religion (4). Whatever be the form, the meaning of the oath is the same. It is calling upon God to witness what we say, and invoking his vengeance, if what we say be false (*a*).

There appears to be no good reason for not admitting the solemn affirmation of a Quaker in all cases, as well as the oath of a Jew or Gentoo, or any other person, who thinks himself really bound by the mode and form in which he attests. Before the revolution, Quakers, who refused to take a legal oath, were treated as obstinate offenders, and subject to penalties (5). But, these hardships have been since removed by the Toleration Act (6), which first allowed them to make a declaration of their fidelity to the state, instead of taking an oath of allegiance, and exempted them from all pains and penalties, on their making, if required, certain other declarations there prescribed. And now by

(1) Dutton v. Colt, 2 Sid. 6.

(2) Per Gold,J. in Mildrone's case, 1 Leach Cr. C. 459. Mee v. Reed, Peake's N. P. C. 22, S. P.

(3) Morgan's case, 1 Leach Cr. C. 64. per Gold,J. delivering the opinion of all the judges. Cowp. 390. Fachina v. Sabine, 2 Stra. 1104.

(4) Omichund and Barker, 1 Atk. 21.

(5) St. 13 C. 2. c. 1.

(6) St. 1 W. & M. c. 18. s. 13.

(*a*) Vide *Rex* v. *Gilham*, 1 *Esp.* 285. The ancient mode of administering oaths in France was thus;—the witness, if a layman, raised his right hand, or if a priest, placed it upon his breast. The same form, at least the raising the right hand, has continued after the revolution, and a deposition taken in France and sworn to in this manner was admitted in evidence by the Supreme Court of Massachusetts. *Vail* v. *Nickerson*, 6 *Mass. Rep.* 262.

subsequent Acts (7), their solemn affirmation in Courts of Justice is admitted to have the same effect as an oath taken in the usual form, excepting only, that on such affirmation
* 21 *they are not permitted to give evidence in *criminal* cases. This exception has been continued in the several succeeding acts of the legislature on this subject; but the propriety of such a distinction seems questionable; unless, indeed, it can be shown, that evidence requires less sanction in civil cases than in criminal, or that Quakers in making their solemn affirmation do not consider themselves under a strict religious obligation to speak the truth (*a*).

The legislature, by not admitting the affirmation of Quakers in *criminal* cases, must be understood to mean causes *technically criminal*. They may be received in penal actions: as, in an action for debt on the statute against bribery in elections (1): so, on a motion for an attachment for non-performance of an award (2), or on a motion to quash an appointment of overseers (3); these proceedings being of a civil, not a criminal nature.

(7) St. 7 & 8 W. 3. c. 34. St. 8 G. 1. c. 6. St. 22 G. 2. c. 46. s. 36.

(1) Atcheson v. Everett, Cowp. 382.

(2) Taylor v. Scott, cited Cowp. 394. Powel v. Ward, cited Andr. 200.

(3) R. v. Turner, 2 Str. 1219.

(*a*) In the state of New-York oaths may be administered to persons who shall declare that they have conscientious scruples about the present mode of administering oaths, in the following manner:—the person swearing shall, with his or her hand uplifted, swear by the ever living God, and shall not be compelled to lay the hand on, or kiss the gospel; and oaths so administered shall be equally effectual, and expose such persons to the like pains and penalties for wilful and corrupt perjury, as oaths administered in the usual form. Sess. 36. c. 13. s. 15. 1 R. L. 386. And by the next section, persons believing in the existence of a Supreme Being, and a future state of rewards and punishments, who shall have conscientious scruples against taking an oath, may be admitted to make an affirmation; which shall be equally valid as an oath in the usual form, and subject the party to the penalties of wilful and corrupt perjury.

But in all cases, which are substantially of a criminal nature, the affirmation of a Quaker is inadmissible; as, in an appeal for murder (4), though it is in form a civil proceeding; so on a motion for an information for a misdemeanor (5), or on exhibiting articles of the peace (6), or on a motion for non-performance of an order of Court (7). Where the application to the court is *against* a Quaker, his affirmation may be received in his own defence, though the proceeding be of a criminal nature (8).

It has been observed by Lord Mansfield (9), that Quakers are at present under some hardship, in not being able to call other Quakers as witnesses in their defence, on a charge of treason or felony; since in these cases, witnesses *on behalf of the prisoner are to be *sworn*, before they can give evidence, like witnesses for the crown (1); and no exception is made in the statute, in order to give a prisoner the benefit of a Quaker's testimony. * 22

(1) St. 7 & 8 W. & M. c. 3. s. 1. St. 1 Ann. st. 2. c. 9. s. 3.

CHAP. IV.

Incompetency from Infamy of Character.

Sect. I.

Of the Offences which incapacitate.

A THIRD cause of incompetency proceeds from the conviction of certain crimes, or from infamy of character.

(4) Castil v. Bainbridge, 2 Str. 856. Cowp. 392.
(5) R. v. Wych, 2 Str. 872. R. v. Gardner, 2 Burr. 1117.
(6) R. v. Green, 1 Str. 527.
(7) Skipp v. Harwood. Willes 291. and see n. (b) ib. where the cases on this subject are collected.
(8) R. v. Shacklington, And. 201. n. R. v. Gardner, 2 Burr. 1117. Cowp. 383. 392.
(9) Cowp. 391.

subsequent Acts (7), their solemn affirmation in Courts of Justice is admitted to have the same effect as an oath taken in the usual form, excepting only, that on such affirmation
* 21 *they are not permitted to give evidence in *criminal* cases. This exception has been continued in the several succeeding acts of the legislature on this subject; but the propriety of such a distinction seems questionable; unless, indeed, it can be shown, that evidence requires less sanction in civil cases than in criminal, or that Quakers in making their solemn affirmation do not consider themselves under a strict religious obligation to speak the truth (*a*).

The legislature, by not admitting the affirmation of Quakers in *criminal* cases, must be understood to mean causes *technically criminal*. They may be received in penal actions: as, in an action for debt on the statute against bribery in elections (1): so, on a motion for an attachment for non-performance of an award (2), or on a motion to quash an appointment of overseers (3); these proceedings being of a civil, not a criminal nature.

(7) St. 7 & 8 W. 3. c. 34. St. 8 G. 1. c. 6. St. 22 G. 2. c. 46. s. 36.

(1) Atcheson v. Everett, Cowp. 382.

(2) Taylor v. Scott, cited Cowp. 394. Powel v. Ward, cited Andr. 200.

(3) R. v. Turner, 2 Str. 1219.

(*a*) In the state of New-York oaths may be administered to persons who shall declare that they have conscientious scruples about the present mode of administering oaths, in the following manner:—the person swearing shall, with his or her hand uplifted, swear by the ever living God, and shall not be compelled to lay the hand on, or kiss the gospel; and oaths so administered shall be equally effectual, and expose such persons to the like pains and penalties for wilful and corrupt perjury, as oaths administered in the usual form. Sess. 36. c. 13. s. 15. 1 R. L. 386. And by the next section, persons believing in the existence of a Supreme Being, and a future state of rewards and punishments, who shall have conscientious scruples against taking an oath, may be admitted to make an affirmation; which shall be equally valid as an oath in the usual form, and subject the party to the penalties of wilful and corrupt perjury.

But in all cases, which are substantially of a criminal nature, the affirmation of a Quaker is inadmissible; as, in an appeal for murder (4), though it is in form a civil proceeding; so on a motion for an information for a misdemeanor (5), or on exhibiting articles of the peace (6), or on a motion for non-performance of an order of Court (7). Where the application to the court is *against* a Quaker, his affirmation may be received in his own defence, though the proceeding be of a criminal nature (8).

It has been observed by Lord Mansfield (9), that Quakers are at present under some hardship, in not being able to call other Quakers as witnesses in their defence, on a charge of treason or felony; since in these cases, witnesses *on behalf of the prisoner are to be *sworn*, before they can give evidence, like witnesses for the crown (1); and no exception is made in the statute, in order to give a prisoner the benefit of a Quaker's testimony. * 22

(1) St. 7 & 8 W. & M. c. 3. s. 1. St. 1 Ann. st. 2. c. 9. s. 3.

CHAP. IV.

Incompetency from Infamy of Character.

Sect. I.

Of the Offences which incapacitate.

A third cause of incompetency proceeds from the conviction of certain crimes, or from infamy of character.

(4) Castil v. Bainbridge, 2 Str. 856. Cowp. 392.

(5) R. v. Wych, 2 Str. 872. R. v. Gardner, 2 Burr. 1117.

(6) R. v. Green, 1 Str. 527.

(7) Skipp v. Harwood. Willes 291. and see n. (b) ib. where the cases on this subject are collected.

(8) R. v. Shacklington, And. 201. n. R. v. Gardner, 2 Burr. 1117. Cowp. 383. 392.

(9) Cowp. 391.

What offences incapacitate.

There are many offences, which our law considers such blemishes on the moral character, as to incapacitate from giving evidence in courts of justice (1); as, treason, and every species of the *crimen falsi* (*a*), such as forgery, perjury, subornation of perjury, attaint of false verdict, and other offences of the same kind, which necessarily imply falsehood (2). The whole class of offences which come under the denomination of *felony* (3), that is, all offences which occasion a forfeiture of lands or goods, will have the same effect in rendering a witness incompetent; though it is obvious, that crimes are not always punished by the legislature in proportion to their guilt, and there may be more depravity in frauds, which are not punishable, than in some kinds of felony. By the common law, a person convicted of petty larceny was not a competent witness, as the offence was felony no
*23 *less than grand larceny (1); but now by stat. 31 G. 3. c. 35. it is enacted, that no person shall be incompetent by reason of a conviction for petty larceny. Some other offences also make a witness incompetent after conviction; as, a conspiracy to accuse another of a crime (2), præmunire (2), barretry (3), or conviction for bribing a witness to absent himself and not give evidence (4). So, it should seem, a person, who has been convicted of winning by fraud or ill practice in certain games, would not be a competent witness, since the stat. 9 Ann. c. 14. s. 5. not only inflicts a penalty, but also enacts that he shall be deemed infamous; and one of the legal consequences of infamy is incompetency to give

(1) Gilb. Ev. 126. Bull. N. P. 291.

(2) Co. Litt. 6. *b*. Hawk. b. 2. c. 46. s. 101. Com. Dig. Testmoigne, A. 5. 2 H. P. C. 277. Fortesc. Rep. 209. Jones v. Mason, 2 Stra. 833. Walker v. Kearney, 2 Stra. 1148.

(3) Co. Litt. 6. *b*. Com. Dig. *ubi sup*.

(1) 2 H. P. C. 277. Pendock v. Mackinder, Willes 667; where the authorities on this point are collected.

(2) 2 H. P. C. 277. Co. Lit. 6. *b*. Hawk. P. C. b. 1. c. 72. s. 9. Com. Dig. *ubi sup*. 4 Blac. Com. 103. 136.

(3) R. v. Ford, 2 Salk. 690. Bull. N. P. 292. See Com. Dig. tit. Testmoigne A. 5.

(4) Adjudged in Clancey's case, by 7 judges; Holt, C. J. doubting at first. Fortesc. Rep. 208.

(*a*) *Cushman* v. *Loker*, 2 *Mass. Rep.* 108.

evidence in a court of justice (5). As convicts in such offences cannot be witnesses, they cannot make affidavits to support a charge *against* others, but, to exculpate or defend themselves, their affidavits have been allowed (6); and upon the same principle the affirmation of Quakers are admitted in their own defence on a criminal charge. Outlawry in a personal action is no ground of exception (7). But judgment of outlawry for treason or felony, appearing on record by the sheriff's return of the exigent (8), has the same effect as judgment after a verdict or confession: it follows, therefore, that such an outlaw cannot be a competent witness (9).

Some kinds of *punishment* were formerly thought to be marks of infamy, and therefore witnesses were frequently rejected after standing in the pillory, or after branding; these being the usual punishments for the *crimen falsi* (10). *But the distinction is obvious, and now clearly settled; it is not the punishment, but the nature of the offence, that causes infamy (1). Thus, it is no objection against the competency of a witness, that he has been in the pillory for a libel on the government, or for a trespass, or a riot (2): he is not incompetent, unless he has suffered for the *crimen falsi*, as, for perjury, &c., in which case, it is the crime, not the punishment, that incapacitates. And, on the other hand, after judgment for the latter kind of offence, he is not competent, though the punishment may have been only a fine (3). It is not the punishment, but the crime, that affects the competency of a witness. * 24

The rule most commonly laid down is, that a *conviction*

(5) Co. Lit. 6. *b*. Fortesc. 208.

(6) Davis and Carter's case, 2 Salk. 461. Charlesworth's case cited by the Court in Walker v. Kearney, 2 Str. 1148.

(7) Co. Lit. 6. *b*. Com. Dig. Testm. A. 5. Hawk. P. C. b. 1. c. 72. s. 107.

(8) 3 Inst. 212. Hawk. P. C. b. 2. c. 48. s. 22.

(9) Celier's case, Sir T. Raym. 369.

(10) 2 H. P. C. 277. Co. Lit. 66.

(1) Gilb. Ev. 127. Bull. N. P. 292. R. v. Davis, 5 Mod. 75. R. v. Ford, 2 Salk. 690. Pendock v. Mackinder, 2 Wils. 18. Willes 666. S. C. Fortesc. 209.

(2) Chater v. Hawkins, 3 Lev. 426. Com. Dig. Testm. A. 5. Gilb. Ev. 127. Fortesc. Rep. 209.

(3) R. v. Ford, 2 Salk. 690. Bull. N. P. 292. Crosby's case, 10. St. Tr. 42 Appx.

makes the witness incompetent: but it is not to be understood, that conviction alone incapacitates; for, on a motion in arrest of judgment, it may possibly be quashed (4). The judgment, therefore, as well as the conviction, must be proved, and can only be proved by the record or by a copy of the record (5). Even an admission by the witness himself, of his being in prison under judgment for grand larceny (6), or, of his having been guilty of perjury (7) on another occasion, will not make him incompetent, however it may affect his credit.

Competency how restored.

A person convicted of felony being thus disabled from giving evidence, it remains to be considered by what means the disability may be removed. In ancient times, this was effected in many cases by a proceeding then in use, called purgation (8), by which all persons, entitled to the benefit *of clergy, were allowed to clear themselves before the ordinary, even after a conviction in the temporal courts. If on this canonical trial the party failed, which seldom happened, he was sentenced to remain in the ordinary's prison; and, on the other hand, upon his acquittal, he was pronounced innocent, absolved from infamy, and discharged from the punishment, incapacity, and discredit incident to the felony. Thus, formerly, allowance of the privilege of clergy, followed by purgation, would restore the competency of a witness. But it was afterwards found necessary to abolish this mode of trial by purgation; and therefore, the st. 18 Eliz. c. 7. s. 3. enacted, that persons admitted to the benefit of clergy, should no longer be delivered to the ordinary for purgation; but "after the clergy allowed and burning in the hand, should forthwith be enlarged and delivered out of prison." In the construction of this statute, the judges held, that as the old mode of purgation was thus taken away, the burning in the hand should

*25

(4) Lee v. Gansel, Cowp. 8. Gilb. Ev. 129. Com. Dig. tit. Testm. A. 5. Sutton v. Bishop, 4 Burr. 2283.

(5) Com. Dig. Ib. 8 East 79.

(6) R. v. Castel Careinion, 8 East 78.

(7) R. v. Teal, 11 East 309.

(8) Treby, C. J. in Lord Warwick's case, 5 St. Tr. 172. Hob. 288. Kelyng 37.

be considered as having the same effect in clearing away the disabilities of conviction (1). "It was never the intent of the statute, said Lord Chief Justice Treby in Lord Warwick's case, merely to set at large and leave him a convict-felon; but when it said 'delivered,' it meant delivered free from all incident and further penalties, as if delivered upon purgation (2)." Hence the burning in the hand is considered in the nature of a statute-pardon (3).

In cases where, instead of this burning in the hand, some other punishment has been substituted by act of parliament, (as transportation by st. 4 G. 1. c. 11. or a fine or whipping by st. 19 G. 3. c. 74. s. 3.) felons, within the benefit of clergy, are made competent after suffering such substituted punishment: these statutes expressly providing, that it shall operate as a pardon, and completely remove all incapacities. Peers *of parliament (1), and all clergymen, * 26
are entitled to benefit of clergy, and are, therefore, competent witnesses, without burning in the hand, and consequently without any punishment in its stead (*a*).

It appears to be established by several cases, that proof of the record, whereby clergy is granted, without further proof of the burning in the hand, is not sufficient (2): for the words of the statute are, that he shall be "delivered after clergy allowed and burning in the hand." This, therefore, is necessary to be proved, except in those cases where the benefit of clergy may be allowed without branding, as to a clerk in holy orders or peer of parliament, or where the branding is excused by pardon, or changed for another punishment, (as a fine), and then it must be shown that the witness has suffered such substituted punishment

(1) Heston's case, cited in Foxley's case, 5 Rep. 110. Searle v. Williams, Hob. Rep. 292. Celier's case, Sir T. Raym. 369. Ld. Castlemain's case, Ib. 380. Kelyng 37.

(2) Ld. Warwick's case, 5 St. Tr. 172.

(3) Hob. 292. Bull. N. P. 292.

(1) St. 1 Ed. 6. c. 12. s. 4.

(2) Searle v. Williams, Hob. 288. Armstrong and Lisle, Kel. 93. Ld. Warwick's case, 5 St. Tr. 166.

(*a*) Benefit of clergy is abolished in the state of New-York, sess. 36. c. 8. s. 4. 1 R. L. 495.

instead of the other (3). In Lord Warwick's case, above cited, one who had been convicted of manslaughter and allowed his clergy, but not burnt in the hand (4), was called as witness for the prisoner; and on an objection to his competency, the lords referred it to the judges present, who thought he was not a competent witness, as the statute had made the burning in the hand a condition precedent to the discharge.

As the privilege of clergy, at common law, extended only to capital felonies, and not to petty larcenies or misdemeanors, persons convicted of petty larceny could not be discharged under stat. 18 Eliz. c. 7. s. 3. which relates only to such as were allowed their clergy, nor were they included in stat. 19 G. 3. c. 74. s. 3. which gives a discretionary power to substitute a moderate fine or whipping for burning in the hand (5): so that convicts in petty larceny, though they had suffered the sentence of the law, were still incompetent to give evidence, while in many
* 27 cases *convicts in grand larceny were admissible. This inconsistency was removed by a statute of the present reign, which has been already mentioned (1).

Pardon. The most effectual mode of restoring the competency of a witness is, by a pardon under the great seal, or by act of parliament. Some, indeed, have thought that it can only remove the punishment, not the blemish of character (2). But it is now settled, that a pardon of treason or felony, even after conviction or attainder, not only takes off every part of the punishment, but also clears the party from the legal disabilities of infamy and all other consequences of his crime (3). A pardon, whether under the great seal,

(3) Burridge's case, 3. P. Wms. 485, 490.

(4) This may now be changed to a moderate fine, by st. 19 G. 3. c. 74. s. 3.

(5) St. 4 & 5 H. 7. c. 13.

(1) St. 31 G. 3. c. 35. and 36 G. 3. c. 29. Irish stat.

(2) Lord Coke in Brown v. Crashaw, 2 Bulst. 154. Dodderidge, J. in Harris v. Whyte, Palm. 412. Latch. 81.; and other dicta cited in Hargrave Jurid. Arg. 2 vol. p. 263.

(3) Cuddington v. Wilkins, Hob. 67. 82. Rookwood's case. Rep. Temp. Holt 685. 4 St. Tr. 682. Crosby's case, Lord Raym. 39. Lord Castlemain's case, T. Ray. 379. 2 H. P. C. 278. Hawk. P. C. b. 2. c. 37. s. 48. Com. Dig. Testm. A. 5. Reilly's case, Leach Cr. C. 510.

or by act of parliament, is said to make the witness a new creature, and gives him a new capacity (*a*): the crime, indeed, may still be objected against him, as affecting his credit, but cannot be urged against his competency as a witness. And a pardon, by which the king remits the punishment of burning in the hand, is admitted to have the same operation (4). It is, indeed, highly expedient that a pardon should be allowed to have this effect, and that a discretionary power should be vested in the crown to remove such legal incapacities: otherwise, a person once convicted of felony, would be stigmatized for life, and treated as infamous in courts of law, though in the opinion of mankind his character for truth and honesty may have been completely retrieved.

As in the greater offences, so in those below felony, as perjury at common law, &c. a pardon will restore competency, *where the disability is a consequence of the judgment (1). But where the disability is declared by act of parliament to be part of the punishment, as in the case of a conviction for perjury or subornation of perjury on the stat. 5 Eliz. c. 9. the king's pardon will not make the witness competent (1). In this case the statute expressly provides, that he shall never be admitted to give evidence in courts of justice, until the judgment be reversed (*b*). If the pardon is conditional (2), the performance of the condition ought to be shown; for on that depends all its efficacy. Thus, where the pardon is on condition of transportation for a number of years, the witness is not compe- *28

(4) Rookwood's case, R. T. Holt 685. Warwick's case, 5 St. Tr. 166. Hawk. P. C. b. 2. c. 37. s. 49.

(1) 2 H. P. C. 278. R. v. Greepe, 2 Salk. 514; 1 Lord Raym. 256. S. C. R. v. Ford, 2 Salk. 690. Crosby's case, 2 Salk. 689. Bull. N. P. 292. Hawk. b. 2. c. 46. s. 112. R. v. Warden of the Fleet, Rep. Temp. Holt 135. Anonym. case, 3 Salk. 155.

(2) Hawk. b. 2. c. 37. s. 45.

(*a*) Vide *Deming's case*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 232.

(*b*) A conviction for perjury, or subornation of perjury, produces the like disability in the state of New-York. Sess. 24. c. 74. s. 1. 1 R. L. 171.

tent before the expiration of the term or other lawful determination (3). To prove that a witness, after conviction, has been restored to his competency by pardon, it is necessary to produce the pardon itself under the great seal. A warrant under the privy seal or sign manual, is not sufficient for this purpose, as it is not of itself a complete irrevocable pardon (4).

Sect. II.

Of the Admissibility of Accomplices.

It has been before mentioned, that unless the conviction and judgment are proved, a witness is not incompetent from infamy of character, though he may confess himself guilty of an infamous crime. Nor is it a sufficient objection to his competency, that he has been an accomplice in guilt with the prisoner at the bar. The evidence of accomplices has been at all times admitted (5), from a principle of public *policy and from necessity, as it is scarcely possible to detect conspiracies and many of the worst crimes without their information. But though accomplices are received as witnesses, their testimony ought to be received by a jury with considerable caution and distrust: for, on their own confession, they stand contaminated with guilt, and in the hope of lessening their own infamy will often be tempted to throw as much guilt as possible upon the prisoner. They may be also in some cases entitled to rewards on the prisoner's conviction, and in all cases expect to earn a pardon; and as fear is usually their motive, the same feeling may tempt them to exaggerate their evidence, for the purpose of destroying their former associate and securing themselves against his vengeance.

*29

(3) Hawk. b. 2. c. 37. s. 45. Burridge's case, 3 P. Wms. 485.

(4) Gully's case, Leach Cr. C. 116. Hawk. b. 2. c. 37. s. 50.

(5) 1 H. P. C. 303. Hawk. b. 2. c. 46. s. 94. Gilb. Ev. 123. Rookwood's case, 4 St. Tr. 663. Atwood's case, cited by Grose, J. 7 T. R. 609. Westbeer's case, Leach Cr. C. 14.

The practice of admitting accomplices to give evidence against their associates, has been adopted from analogy to the ancient doctrine of approvement, a part of the old law, which, though now grown obsolete, may properly be mentioned here, from its affinity to the more improved modern usage substituted in its place (1). Approvement is,—when a prisoner, arraigned on a capital charge, confesses the fact before plea pleaded, and accuses his accomplices of the same offence. He must also discover upon oath, not only the particular crime charged upon him, but all treasons and felonies of which he can give any information. It is then in the discretion of the Court either to refuse or admit him to be an approver; and if on his confession it appears that he was a principal, and tempted the others, he ought not to be received. But if he does not discover the whole truth, or, on the trial of the appeal, the party accused should be acquitted, judgment of death passes against him upon his own confession of the indictment.

This practice of allowing approvements, which was at all times in the discretion of the Court, is now grown into *disuse, and entirely discontinued; more mischief having * 30
arisen from false accusations under pretence of approving, than benefit to the public by the discovery and conviction of real offenders (1). Whatever good was to be expected from this old method, is now more effectually provided for and secured, First, by several acts of parliament, which enact, in cases of robbery (2), coining (3), burglary (4), house-breaking (4), horse-stealing (4), privately stealing to the value of five shillings from shops, ware-houses, stables, and coach-houses (4), or uttering counterfeit money (5), that if any such offender, being out of prison, shall discover two or more persons, who have committed the like offences, he shall be entitled to pardon for such crime, on their conviction: Secondly, by special proclamations in the Gazette or otherwise, promising pardon on certain

(1) Rudd's case, Cowp. 335.
(1) 2 Hale P. C. 227. ch. 29.
(2) St. 4 W. & M. c. 8. s. 7.
(3) St. 6. W. 3. c. 17. s. 12.
(4) St. 10. W. 3. c. 23. s. 5. St. 5 Ann. c. 31. s. 4.
(5) St. 15 G. 2. c. 28. s. 4.

conditions: and thirdly, by the modern practice of admitting accomplices to give evidence for the crown, under an implied promise of pardon, on condition of their making a full and fair confession of the whole truth, that is, of all the offences about which they may be questioned, and of all their associates in guilt (6). On a strict and ample performance of this condition, to the satisfaction of the judge presiding at the trial, they have an equitable title to a recommendation for the king's mercy. It is not, however, a matter of course, to admit an offender as witness on the trial of his accomplices, not even after he has been so allowed by the committing magistrate; but a motion for this purpose must be made by the counsel for the prosecution, and the Court under all the circumstances of the case, will either admit or disallow such evidence, as may most effectually answer the purposes of justice (7).

The general rule then is, that a person, who confesses himself guilty of a crime, is a competent witness against
* 31 his *partners in guilt. Thus, if two or more persons are accomplices, one who is indicted, may be witness against the others, though he may have a promise of pardon or reward, on condition of giving evidence against the prisoner (1): so he may even after conviction, if judgment has not passed upon him; for it is not the conviction, but the judgment that creates the disability. So, on the trial of one of several persons, who are indicted separately, the others, who have not been convicted, may be witnesses in his behalf (2). It was formerly thought, from analogy to the ancient doctrine of approvement, that an accomplice, separately indicted for the same offence, could not give evidence against the others, unless he had first pleaded guilty to his indictment (3); but the rule is now settled as above

(6) Rudd's case, Cowp. 339.

(7) Per Buller, J. Maidst. Ass. 1798, Crown Circ. Com. last edit. 51.

(1) Tonge's case, Kel. 17. 1 H.P. C. 303. S. C. Layer's case, 10 St. Tr. 259. Hawk. P. C. b. 2. c. 46. s. 135.

(2) Case of Bilmore and others, 2 H. P. C. 279. 1 H. P. C. 305. Gunston and Downes, 2 Roll. Ab. 685. pl. 3. Hawk. b. 2. c. 46. s. 99. Gilb. Ev. 118. Bath v. Montague, cited Fortesc. Rep. 247.

(3) Sir P. Cresby's case, 1 H. P. C. 303.

stated. On the trial of an accessary (4), for a misdemeanor in receiving stolen goods, under stat. 22 G. 3. c. 58. the principal felon is a competent witness; the statute enacting, that the accessary may be proceeded against, although the principal felon has not been convicted, and whether he be or be not amenable to justice (*a*). So, the principal felon may be a witness, in a prosecution on stat. 4 G. 1. c. 11. for taking a reward to help to stolen goods (5).

The evidence of accomplices is also admitted on the trial of smaller offences. Thus, in an information under stat. 2 G. 2. c. 24. for bribery at an election, a person, who had received a bribe, was admitted a witness against the defendant, though in case of a conviction, he would have been indemnified from the penalties of the act (6). In an action of trespass, a co-trespasser who is not sued, may be *witness against the defendant, though left out of the declaration for that purpose (*b*), and although satisfaction from one is a discharge for all the rest (1). A per- * 32

(4) Haslam's case, 1 Leach Cr. C. 467. Price's case, ib. 468. n.
(1). Patram's case, 2 East P. C. 782.
(5) Wild's case, 2 East P. C. 782.
(6) Bush v. Rawling, Say. 289. cited by Lord Mansfield, Cowp. 199. Snead v. Robinson, Willes 423. and n. (*c*), ib. 425.
(1) Bull. N. P. 286. Luttrel v. Reynel, 1 Mod. 283. Chapman v. Graves and others, 21. Camp. N. P. C. 333. n.

(*a*) There is a similar statute in the state of New-York, sess. 36. c. 8. s. 6. 1 R. L. 496. The law is the same in Vermont, *State* v. *S. L.* 2 *Tyler*, 249.

(*b*) So, it has been held, that where separate actions have been brought against joint trespassers, one of them is a competent witness in the action against the other; the objection goes only to his credibility. *Johnson* v. *Bourn*, 1 *Wash.* 187. A particeps fraudis is a competent witness either to prove or disprove the fraud: as the grantor in a deed, to show that it was fraudulent. *Jackson d. Mapes* v. *Frost & Haff*, 6 *Johns. Rep.* 135.: or the grantee, to show that the grant was without consideration, and so fraudulent as to creditors. *Hill* v. *Payson et al.* 3 *Mass. Rep.* 559. Contra, *Fowler* v. *Norton*, 2 *Root* 231. And in an action on the case for a false affirmation, the person respecting whom the affirmation was made, was held a competent witness for the plaintiff. *Wise* v. *Wilcox*, 1 *Day* 22.

son who has set his name as subscribing witness to a deed or will, may be a witness to prove the instrument a forgery (2) (*a*).

Since accomplices are competent witnesses, it necessarily follows, that if their evidence is believed by a jury, a prisoner may be legally convicted upon it, though it be unsupported by other proof (3). But their testimony *alone* is seldom of sufficient weight with a jury to convict the offenders; the temptation to commit perjury being so great, where the witness by accusing another may escape himself (4). The practice, therefore, is to advise the jury to regard the evidence of an accomplice, only so far as he may be confirmed, in some part of his testimony, by unimpeachable testimony. It is not necessary, that he should be confirmed in every circumstance, which he details in evidence: for there would be no occasion to use him at all as a witness, if his narrative could be completely proved by other evidence free from all suspicion. Nor need it appear from the confirmatory evidence, that he speaks truth with respect to all the prisoners, or with respect to the share which each had in the transaction. But if the jury are satisfied that he speaks truth in those parts, in which they see unimpeachable evidence brought to confirm him, that is a ground for them to believe, that he also speaks truly with regard to the other prisoners, as to whom there may be no confirmation (5).

The cases which have been mentioned, respecting the evidence of accomplices, and on the admissibility of per-

(2) 7 T. R. 604. 611. 6 East 195.

(3) Atwood's case, 2 Leach Cr. C. 521. Durham's case, Ib. 538. Per Lord Ellenborough, C. J. in R. v. Jones, 2 Campb. 133, S. P. 7 T. R. 609.

(4) Per Lord Mansfield, C. J. Cowp. 336.

(5) Per Thompson, B. R. v. Swallow and others, Trials at York, Jan. 1813, on special commission, p. 13. see also p. 3. 50. 150. 165. 201.

(*a*) Vide *Lowe* v. *Jolliffe*, 1 *Black. Rep.* 365. *Fox's lessee* v. *Palmer et al.* 2 *Dall.* 214. *Currie* v. *Donald*, 2 *Wash.* 63. So, a judge who has taken the proof of a deed is a competent witness to invalidate such proof. *Jackson d. Wyckoff* v. *Humphrey*, 1 *Johns. Rep.* 498.

sons *to prove the forgery of an instrument which they have signed as subscribing witnesses, clearly show, that a man's guilt in the transaction disclosed is not a sufficient reason for rejecting his testimony, however it may affect his credibility. In the case of Walton v. Shelley (1), which was an action upon a bond given by the defendant, in consideration of delivering up certain promissory notes, the Court of King's Bench held that the indorser of one of the notes ought not to be allowed to prove the consideration of the note usurious, on a supposed principle of public policy, "that no party who had signed a paper or deed shall ever be permitted to give testimony to invalidate that instrument; because every man, it was said, who is a party to an instrument, gives a credit to it: And it is of consequence to mankind, that no person should hang out false colours to deceive them, by first affixing his signature to a paper, and afterwards by giving evidence to invalidate it (*a*)." This appears to have been the first case in support of such a rule. In the latter case of Jordaine v. Lashbrooke (2), this subject was very fully discussed; and the Court there determined, that in an action on a bill of exchange against the acceptor, the payee, (who was also indorser), was a competent witness for the defendant to prove, that the bill which was unstamped, and purported to be drawn at Hamburgh, was in fact drawn in London, and, therefore, void for the want of a stamp (*b*). "I find no rule, said Mr.

(1) 1 T. R. 296.

(2) 7 T. R. 601, Ashurst, J. *contra*. See 4 Taunt. 464.

(*a*) It has been held, in South Carolina, on the authority of Walton v. Shelly, that the obligee of a bond who had assigned it, in an action by the assignee against the obligor, was not a competent witness to prove payment. *Canty* v. *Sumter*, 2 *Bay* 93. In this case the witness was also party to the record, but no objection appears to have been made on that ground.

(*b*) In *Adams* v. *Lingard et al. Peake* 117, the question in which was exactly the same as in the subsequent case of *Jordaine* v. *Lashbrooke*, Lord Kenyon was of opinion, that the indorser was a competent witness to prove that a bill *dated* at *Madeira*, was in

Justice Lawrence in delivering his opinion, less comprehensive than this, that all persons are admissible witnesses, who have the use of their reason and such religious belief as to feel the obligation of an oath, who have not been convicted of any infamous crime, and are not influenced by interest. Under none of these classes does the witness in this case fall. Whether a defendant shall be allowed to set up such a defence is quite another consideration, than whether the witness be competent. It certainly is of con-
* 34 *sequence to prevent men from hanging out false colours: but this must be applied to the *parties in the cause*, or you may prejudice men who have not hung out such colours (*a*)."

---

fact *drawn* in *London*. Et vide *Buckland* v. *Tankard*, 5 *Term Rep.* 579, per Lord Kenyon. *Rich* v. *Topping*, 1 *Esp.* 176. S. C. *Peake's case*, 224, per Lord Kenyon, who denies the authority of *Walton* v. *Shelly:* but he is opposed by Buller, J. in *Hart* v. *M'Intosh*, 1 *Esp.* 298, *Bent* v. *Baker*, 3 *Term. Rep.* 36. *Phetheon* v. *Whitmore*, *Peake* 40, and *Adams* v. *Lingard et al. Peake* 118. In 1 *Esp.* 177. Lord Kenyon denies that he ever used the words imputed to him in 3 *Term. Rep.* 34. viz. that where a person has signed a negotiable instrument, he shall not be permitted to invalidate it by his testimony. In *Jones* v. *Brook*, 4 *Taunt.* 464. cited post 47. the Court of C. B. expressly recognize the admissibility of a party to a negotiable instrument to impeach it.

(*a*) The rule adopted by the courts of New-York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts is, that a party to a *negotiable* instrument is incompetent to prove it to have, originally, been void. *Winton* v. *Saidler*, 3 *Johns. Cas.* 185. *Coleman* v. *Wise & others*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 165. *Stille* v. *Lynch*, 2 *Dall.* 194. *Respublica* v. *Ross*, *Ib.* 239. *Warren* v. *Merry*, 3 *Mass. Rep.* 27. *Parker* v. *Lovejoy*, *Ib.* 565. *Churchill* v. *Suter*, 4 *Mass. Rep.* 156. *Putnam* v. *Churchill*, *Ib.* 516. *Widgery* v. *Munroe & another*, 6 *Mass. Rep.* 449. *Jones* v. *Coolidge*, 7 *Mass. Rep.* 199. This question has been discussed in the Supreme Court of the United States, but no opinion given on the point, further than a dictum of *Chase*, J.:— "Upon the statute of gaming, usury, and the like, but in no other case, are the drawers, indorsers, &c. competent witnesses. The

CHAP. V.

Of the Incompetency of Witnesses from Interest.

THE fourth ground of incompetency is on account of interest. It is a general rule, that all witnesses interested in the event of the cause are to be excluded from giving

---

cases all show it." *Wilson* v. *Lenox*, 1 *Cranch* 201. Vide post 39. n. (*a*). I cannot find that there has been any decision on the subject in Virginia. In *Baring* v. *Reeder*, 1 *Hen. & Mun.* 154., one of the judges expresses his opinion strongly in favour of the doctrine, in Walton v. Shelly, while another hints a preference to that of Jordaine v. Lashbrooke. In Connecticut the law is still unsettled. *Swift's Ev.* 96. et seq. Et vide *Allen* v. *Holkins*, 1 *Day* 17. *Webb* v. *Danforth*, *Ib.* 301. The rule in Walton v. Shelly, was, in England, soon after the decision in that case, limited to negotiable instruments. *Bent* v. *Baker*, 3 *Term Rep.* 32. 36. and excepting the case cited ante 33 n. (*a*) the courts in this country, have resisted every attempt to extend it to instruments not negotiable. *Steinback* v. *Rhinelander*, 3 *Johns. Cas.* 269. *Pleasants* v. *Pemberton*, 2 *Dall.* 196. *Baring* v. *Shippen*, 2 *Binney* 154. *Brown* v. *Babcock*, 3 *Mass. Rep.* 29. *Storer* v. *Logan & others*, 9 *Mass. Rep.* 55. ante 32. n. (*a*). And a party to a negotiable instrument may testify to subsequent facts which do not prove it to have been originally void, as payment:—*Charrington* v. *Miller*, *Peake*, 6. *Humphrey* v. *Moxon*, *Ib.* 52. *Warren* v. *Merry*, 3 *Mass. Rep.* 27. *White* v. *Kibbing*, 11 *Johns. Rep.* 128.—that the note was indorsed after it became due. *Baker & Rowlson* v. *Arnold*, 1 *Caines' Rep.* 258.—that the date had been altered. *Levy* v. *Essex*, *Chitty on Bills* 284. *Parker* v. *Hanson*, 7 *Mass. Rep.* 470. That the holder and indorsee of the bill had received it from the indorser, the witness, (who had secured himself from liability by a special indorsement,) in trust for the payees, and as their agent to collect, so as to let in the defence, that the drawer had been requested by the payees not to pay it to the indorsee, and thereby to defeat his action. *Barker* v. *Prentiss*, 6 *Mass. Rep.* 430. Or, that an accommodation note which had been delivered to a

evidence in favour of the party to which their interest inclines them. They are excluded from a supposed want of integrity; and not, as some have supposed, that they may be saved from the temptation to commit perjury. If that were the true principle, there would be some inconsistency in excluding witnesses who have an interest even to the smallest amount, at the same time that a son is allowed to give evidence for the father, and a witness is not privileged from answering, when called to speak *against* his interest. The temptation to perjury may be much stronger in these two last cases, than in the former; yet in the one the witness will be *permitted*, in the other *compelled* to give evidence. "Where a man, says Chief Baron Gilbert, who is interested in the matter in question, comes to prove it, it is rather a ground for distrust than any just cause of belief; for men are generally so shortsighted as to look at their own private benefit which is near to them, rather than to the good of the world, that is more remote; therefore, from the nature of human passions and actions, there is more reason to distrust such a biassed testimony, than to believe it." Perhaps it may appear rather doubtful, whether such an exclusive rule has answered the purposes for which it was intended, and whether upon the whole it may not have contributed to obstruct rather than to pro-
* 35 *mote the ends of public justice. It is certain, that Courts of justice now generally adopt the principle, that it is wiser to hear the witness than at once to reject him unheard and untried; and they endeavour as far as possible, consistently with former decisions, to receive the testimony of witnesses, leaving it afterwards to the jury to consider, how far it has been supported by other evidence, or from its own character may be entitled to credit. The legisla-

---

third person to get discounted, was converted by him to his own use. *Woodhull* v. *Holmes*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 231. But it has been held in an action between the indorsee and maker of a promissory note, that the indorser was not a competent witness to prove usury in the transfer. *Minning* v. *Wheatland*, 10 *Mass. Rep.* 502.

ture also shows, that it acts upon the same principle, by having provided in many instances for the admissibility of witnesses, when they must otherwise have been rejected as incompetent.

In treating of the incompetency of interested witnesses, it is proposed to consider the subject in the following order;

First, with respect to the *nature* of the interest, which will disqualify;

Secondly, of the rule on the subject of interest, considered with reference to the parties in the suit;

Thirdly, of the same rule considered with reference to the husband or wife of the party;

Fourthly, of the effect of admissions by a party to the suit or his agent, *against* the party's interest.

Fifthly, of the admissibility of the confession of a prisoner against himself;

Sixthly, of the competency of the party injured, as witness in criminal prosecutions;

Seventhly, of certain exceptions to the general rule on the subject of interest; and

*Lastly, of the means by which the competency of an interested witness may be restored. * 36

Sect. 1.

Of the Nature of the Interest, which disqualifies a Witness.

It is scarcely possible to reconcile the earlier cases on this subject with those of a more recent date. The old cases respecting the incompetency of witnesses, were generally decided on very narrow grounds. Evidence, which ought to have been admitted, although received with caution, was at once excluded without being heard; as if juries were not to be trusted with all the means of deciding right, because it was possible their decision might be wrong,

At one time it was generally held, that, if a witness had an interest in the *question* put to him, he was incompetent. Thus it has been laid down in some of the earlier cases as a general rule, that one commoner cannot be a witness for another commoner; and that in an action on a policy of insurance one underwriter cannot be a witness for another. But a distinction has since been made between an interest in the *question* put to a witness and an interest in *the event of the suit* (1); and the general rule now established is, that a witness will not be disqualified on the ground of interest, unless he is interested in the event of the suit (*a*). The

(1) 1 T. R. 302. 3 T. R. 36. 7 T. R. 603.

(*a*) The rule in the text has been frequently recognized in this country. The Supreme Court of the state of New-York sum up the law on this subject in the following words :—" The rule by which a witness is excluded on the ground of interest, seems to have fluctuated, at different periods, but on a careful examination of all the authorities, ancient and modern, the general rule will be found to be, that if a witness will not gain or lose, by the *event* of the cause, or if the verdict cannot be given in evidence, *for* or *against* him, in another suit, the objection goes to his credit only, and not to his competency. Generally, therefore, an interest in the *question* alone will not disqualify the witness, but the objection goes to his credit only. We do not mean to say but that there may be some technical exceptions to the rule, but the rule in its general application, is correct, and is the one adopted by the court." *Van Nuys* v. *Terhune*, 3 *Johns. Cas.* 83. The Supreme Court of Connecticut speak expressly to the same effect: " The common law recognizes but one description of interest that shall exclude a person from testifying: that is an interest in the event of the suit. Merely an interest *in the question*, as it is called,—his having, or being likely to have, a suit, which may turn upon the same point, is not, in legal estimation, an interest. It is a *bias*, affecting his credit, but not his competency. So is the law understood by the courts at Westminster. Precedents to the contrary which misled them for a time, as they have the courts in this state, have been found, on examination, to be departures from the law. It was never, indeed, admitted in principle, that bias, without interest,

question then resolves itself into this, whether the witness, proposed to be examined, has an interest in the event. In considering this subject, the simplest method will be to ascertain, in the first place, what is not such an interest in the event as will disqualify a witness from giving evidence, and then to inquire what is such an interest as will disqualify him (*b*).

It is not an objection to the competency of a witness, that he may have wishes or a strong bias on the subject matter *of the suit, or that he may expect some benefit from the result of the trial. Such circumstances may influence his mind, and affect his credibility; they are therefore always open to observation, and ought to be carefully weighed by the jury, who are to determine what dependence they * 37

---

went to the competency of a witness, nor could it be, without rendering the rule of admission too uncertain for practice, and too limited for the investigation of truth. The error that crept into practice, was that of mistaking bias for interest. In this case the witness offered was neither to gain nor lose by the event of the suit. The verdict which his testimony might have affected, could never have been given in evidence for, or against him. He ought, therefore, to have been sworn, notwithstanding his supposed bias, and his credit left to the jury, with such observations, as the court might think proper to make, to assist them in estimating it correctly." *Phelps* v. *Winchel*, 1 *Day* 270. See further as to the general rule that an interest in the question does not render a witness incompetent: —*Pettingal* v. *Brown*, 1 *Caines' Rep.* 171. *Baker* v. *Arnold*, *Ib.* 276. *The People* v. *Howell*, 4 *Johns. Rep.* 302. *Stewart* v. *Kip*, 5 *Johns. Rep.* 256. *Fairchild* v. *Beach*, 1 *Day* 266. *Bulkley* v. *Storer*, 2 *Day* 531. *Wakeley* v. *Hart & others*, 6 *Binney* 316. *Farrel* v. *Perry*, 1 *Hayw.* 2. *Porter* v. *M'Clure*, *Ib.* 360. *Treasurer of the State* v. *Nall*, *Tayl.* 5. *Denn d. Beatty* v. *Ib.* 9. *Baring* v. *Reeder*, 1 *Hen. & Mun.* 165. 168.

(*b*) Proof that a witness has confessed himself interested in the event of a cause, is not sufficient to disqualify him. But where it is proved that the party by whom the witness is introduced, has acknowledged him so interested, the witness ought not to be sworn. *Peirce* v. *Chase*, 8 *Mass. Rep.* 487.

can have on his testimony; but they will not render him incompetent. A witness who stands in the same situation as the party, for whom he is called to give evidence, is under a srong bias, but is not on that account disqualified. Thus, if there are two actions brought against two persons for the same assault, in the action against one the other may (*a*) be a witness (1); or if several persons are separately indicted for perjury in swearing to the same fact, either of them before conviction may be a witness on the trial of the others (2). So in Rudd's case (3), a woman, whose husband had been before convicted, was admitted to give evidence against the prisoner, though she expected that, in case of his conviction, her husband would receive a pardon. So, in the case of Bent v. Baker, which was an action against an underwriter on a policy of insurance, the court held, after much argument, that another underwriter was a competent witness (4). This case came before the Court of King's Bench, by writ of error from the Court of Common Pleas; a writ of error was afterwards brought to reverse the judgment of that court, but was at length abandoned (5). It has always been considered a case of great

(1) Per Buller, J. 1 T. R. 301.

(2) Bath v. Montague, cited Fortesc. Rep. 247. Gunstone v. Downes 2 Roll. Abr. 685, Art. 3; S. C. cited 2 H. P. C. 280, and in R. v. Gray, (or Bray,) 2 Sel. N. P. 1046.

(3) 1 Leach Cr. C. 151.

(4) 3 T. R. 27. Bull. N. P. 283, S. P.

(5) 7 T. R. 604.

(*a*) S. P. *Johnson* v. *Bourn*, 1 *Wash.* 187. So, in an action of trespass de bonis asportatis, the person at whose command, or as the agent of whom the trespass was committed, is a competent witness. *Hasbrouck* v. *Lown*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 377. So, in an action for seaman's wages, another seaman on board of the same vessel, who had a like demand for wages against the defendant, is a competent witness for the plaintiff. *Hoyt* v. *Wildfire*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 518. In a court of admiralty the witness would have been considered incompetent. 1 *Peter's Adm. Dec.* 211. 3 *Johns. Rep.* 523. But in a suit in the admiralty for wages, the master was held a competent witness for the owners of the vessel. *Lady Ann Wardell*, 1 *Edwards* 235.

authority, and deserves to be particularly noticed, as it is one of the leading cases which have established the rule of evidence on this subject. The principal question in that case was, whether a person, who had been employed as broker by the plaintiff in procuring the policy to be subscribed by the defendant, and had afterwards himself subscribed the policy as assurer, was a competent witness for *the defendant. The court adjudged that he was competent; Lord Kenyon, C. J., Mr. Justice Buller, and Mr. Justice Grose, held, that he ought not to have been rejected, on the broad and general ground, because he was not interested in the event; Mr. Justice Ashurst, on a narrower ground, because the witness stood in the particular situation of broker, and having made himself a party to the policy he ought not to be allowed by his own act to deprive either party of the benefit of his testimony. The other judges concurred in that opinion; but Lord Kenyon, C. J. declared, that the other was the principal ground of his opinion. He said, "The objection is, that the witness was underwriter on the same policy. I must acknowledge, that there have been various opinions upon this subject, and that it is impossible to reconcile all the cases. Then we have only to consider what are the principles and good sense to be extracted from them all. I think the principle is this; if the proceeding in the cause cannot be used for him, he is a competent witness, although he may entertain wishes upon the subject: for that only goes to his credit, and not to his competency."

* 38

For the same reason, a witness is not incompetent on the ground, that the verdict may afterwards come to the hearing of a jury in an action brought by the witness himself, and so have an influence on their judgment, though not in evidence before them. Lord Holt, indeed, in the case of the King v. Whiting (1), on an indictment for a cheat, in obtaining a person's subscription to a note of 100l. instead of 5l., rejected the evidence of the maker of the note;

(1) 1 Salk. 283.

Lord Holt said, the verdict would be certainly heard of, in an action on the note, to influence the jury. This decision was followed by Lord Hardwicke, C. J. in the case of the King v. Nunez (2): but afterwards in the case of the King v. Bray (3), Lord Hardwicke reviewed his own opin-
* 39 ion and *that of Lord Holt, and decided that the objection went only to the credit and not to the competency of the witness; and with respect to the possibility that the jury might hear of the verdict, he said, that sitting as judge he could only hear of it judicially. Thus, where A having brought an action against B, (who filed a bill in equity for an injunction, and after answer put in by A, denying the allegations in the bill, the injunction was dissolved,) A was afterwards indicted for perjury alleged to have been committed in his answer, and the indictment came on to be tried immediately before the action, the Court of King's Bench determined that B was a competent witness and had been properly admitted to give evidence on the trial; as he could not avail himself of the conviction of A in any civil proceedings between them either in law or equity (1). So a person, who has borrowed money on an usurious transaction, is a competent witness for the plaintiff in an action for penalties against the lender (2); and, whether he has or has not repaid the money lent, does appear to make any essential difference, at least so far as his *competency* is affected *; for in neither case does he gain any

(2) 2 Stra. 1043.
(3) Rep. Temp. Hard. 358.
(1) R. v. Boston, 4 East 572. See *post*, Sect. VI.
(2) Abrahams q. t. v. Bunn, 4 Burr. 2251. Smith v. Prager, 7 T. R. 60. See Masters v. Drayton, 2 T. R. 496.

* In the case of Smith q. t. v. Prager, the witness said he had repaid the principal sum and interest by drafts which had been duly honoured, and that he was still indebted to the defendant on a running account for this and other loans. It may be observed, that at the time of the trial the witness was an uncertificated bankrupt: but this was not considered as furnishing any objection. (See Masters q. t. v. Drayton, 2 T. R. 496. See also Ridley v. Taylor, 13 East, 175.) In the first case cited, of Abrahams q. t. v. Bunn, the witness proved, that he had redeemed the pledges and repaid the principal sum, and he was competent to prove that fact. Lord Mansfield is reported to have said, "that if the defendant had produced a security or proved the pledge to be remaining in

thing immediately by the event of the suit, nor can he give the judgment in evidence in an action against him for the money lent (*a*). A mere contingent benefit, then, which *may result to the witness from the event of the suit, (as, that it may possibly be more easy for him to establish his own claim, in case the party calling him should succeed,) can only affect his credit and not his competency, unless the verdict would be evidence for him (*b*). * 40

Upon the same principle, a witness, who has acted un-

his custody, it would have been a different consideration, whether the witness who was the borrower of the money could be examined to contradict this." However, it may be inferred from the case of Jordaine v. Lashbrooke, which has been before mentioned, that this consideration would not now affect the *competency* of the witness. See *Supra*, p. 33.

(*a*) In *Pettingal* v. *Brown*, 1 *Caines' Rep.* 168. the borrower, who was offered to prove the usury, had discharged the debt: But, in the *Commonwealth* v. *Frost*, 5 *Mass. Rep.* 53, it was expressly decided, that the non-payment of the loan did not affect the competency of the witness. This last case seems to be an authority, that a party to a negotiable instrument is competent to prove it usurious in an action for penalties under the statute; conformably to the dictum of Chase, J. cited ante 34. *n.* (*a*).

(*b*) There must be a legal, fixed interest, in order to disqualify a witness, *Stockham* v. *Jones & others*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 21. In order to show a witness interested, it is necessary to prove that he must derive a certain benefit from the determination of the cause one way or the other. Per Buller, J., 1 *Term Rep.* 164. A remote or contingent interest affects his credit only. *Stewart* v. *Kip*, 5 *Johns. Rep.* 256. *Falls & Smith* v. *Belknap*, 1 *Johns. Rep.* 491. 1 *Caines' Rep.* 276. *Peterson* v. *Willing & al.* 3 *Dall.* 508. *Post* 48. *Phelps* v. *Hall*, 2 *Tyler* 399. The bare possibility of an action being brought against the witness is no objection to his competency. *Carter* v. *Pearce*, 1 *Term Rep.* 163. And therefore in an action against a sheriff for the escape of a prisoner, in execution, from the jail liberties, the deputy sheriff who had taken the prisoner's bonds for the liberties, was held a competent witness for the defendant: for the interest of the witness was barely possible, in consequence of his having taken the bond; it depended on the solvency of the obligors, and on the fact whether he had acted fairly and honestly in taking it. *Stewart* v. *Kip*, ubi sup.

der a bare authority, is not to be excluded from giving his testimony, on the ground, that he may be liable to an information or an action in case the fact, which he comes to prove, should be found otherwise (1). Thus persons, who have been themselves in office, are often called to show what the usage is, and what they did when in office; yet if their acts be illegal, they are liable to a quo warranto (1). If persons were not allowed to be competent witnesses in matters belonging to corporations, because they may possibly be punished by information, much good evidence would be shut out. Wherever any unlawful act is done in a corporate assembly, the whole assembly are liable to an information; yet the persons who were present at such assemblies are always allowed to be good witnesses; and if they were not allowed, there would be no evidence at all as to such facts (2). So a witness may prove a codicil made subsequent to a second will, and reviving a former will though he has acted under the first will, and might be liable to actions as executor de son tort, if it should be set aside (3). Indeed, it may be laid down as a general rule, that executors in trust, trustees, and agents, are not incompetent merely on the ground of their liability to action (4).

* 41 *In the cases which have been mentioned, the objection against the witness was, that either from the circumstance of his standing in the same situation as the party for whom he was called, or because the verdict might possibly influence the jury in a cause in which he himself might be party, or from some other cause of the same kind, that he expected a benefit from the result of the suit. The witness

(1) R. v. Bray, Rep. Temp. Hard. 360; 2 Sel. N. P. 1045, S. C. 2 Str. 1069. S. P. Baillie v. Wilson, cited 4 Burr. 2254. See Carpenter's Company, &c. v. Hayward, 1 Doug. 374.

(2) By Lord Hardwicke, C. J. R. v. Gray, (or Bray,) 2 Selw. N. P. 1045.

(3) Baillie v. Wilson, cit. 4 Burr. 2254. Goodtitle d. Fowler v. Welford, 1 Doug. 140.

(4) 1 Mod. 107. Goss v. Tracy, 1 P. Will. 287. 1 Black. Rep. 366. Gilb. Ev. 123. Goodtitle v. Fowler, 1 Doug. 140. Bettison v. Bromley, 12 East 250. See 1 Ball & Beatty's Rep. 100. 414, and cases there cited, as to the rule in equity.

in those cases would probably have admitted, that he *thought himself* interested, it was upon the supposition of this fact, that the objection must have been founded. Those cases, therefore, in which such objections were over-ruled, appear to have determined this point, that a witness will not be incompetent merely on the ground of his *thinking* himself interested. It is true, if he believes himself interested, the impression on his mind, and his bias in favour of the party calling him, may be as strong as if he were legally incompetent. But the difference is, that in the one case the inquiry is more simple and more easily defined; in the other, it is complicated, vague, and uncertain. For the purpose of determining that a witness is incompetent on account of his believing himself interested, it might be necessary to examine him on a great variety of points, which after all would be more proper for the consideration of the jury, as for example, on the nature of the benefit which he expects, the reasons for his expecting it, and the impression which such an expectation may have produced upon his mind. Such an inquiry would in all cases be extremely indefinite, and would be subject to this great inconvenience, that it might lead to the rejection of a witness, who, on further examination, might appear to deserve the highest credit, and might have it in his power to give important evidence. The rule of law respecting interested witnesses is perhaps the best that could be adopted, because it is the least exclusive and most accurately defined. It excludes such only as have an interest in the event of the suit; not that in all cases they are likely to feel a stronger bias than persons, who may perhaps expect some benefit from the event, or may be friends or relations to the party, and yet are not on that account incompetent; but *the kind of interest, which is marked out * 42
as the cause of incompetency, is in general more direct and immediate, and more easily ascertained. It has been held, therefore, that a witness is not incompetent, who believes himself under an obligation of honour to indemnify the bail, unless he has in fact entered into an engagement to

that effect (1). Such an obligation is in general of a nature so uncertain and variable, that it cannot safely be recognized in courts of justice as a motive of conduct. Besides, where the sense of honour is so strong and binding as to influence him against his interest, it must be unnecessary to reject the witness, as the same principle, which would induce him to pay the costs, would oblige him in giving his evidence to speak only the truth; and in cases where the sense of honour is less firm and imperative, the ground of the objection fails, since the witness is not bound in point of law, and does not feel himself absolutely bound in point of morals. But, independent of this reasoning, another more general answer is, that the ends of justice are more effectually attained by a full and complete investigation of the subject in dispute, and unless the objection to the witness is strictly a legal objection, he will be admitted to give evidence. In the case supposed, of a witness who says he thinks himself bound in honour to pay the costs, it might be injurious to the party who calls him to be deprived of his testimony on account of such a fancied obligation; more especially as it is an obligation which may easily be pretended by the witness, but which it is scarcely possible for the court justly to appreciate, and which from the nature of the case the party cannot release, nor yet enforce against the witness; on the other hand, his testimony may not deserve all the credit due to a witness free from bias, and it ought, therefore, to be strictly examined and sifted. The witness then is to be heard, but his evidence is open to observation (*a*).

* 43 *However, it is to be observed, that there are several

(1) Pederson v. Stoffles, 1 Camp. 145. S. P., said to have been ruled *contra*, in an old case, by Parker, C. J., See Fotheringham v. Greenwood, 1 Str. 129.

(*a*) In a qui tam action to recover a penalty for selling a slave brought into the state, a member of the New-York society for the manumission of slaves, who on his *voire dire* said, " that if the plaintiff failed, and should ask him, he thought he should give something,

dicta in favour of the position, that a witness is not competent, if he *believes himself* interested, whether he is or is not interested in strictness of law (1). But these dicta were not the ground of the determination in the cases then before the Court, nor was it necessary to determine the point; and further, the general rule of law on the subject of interest was not at that time so clearly settled, as it has since been by many later authorities (*a*). In a late case (2),

(1) By Pratt, C. J. in Fotheringham v. Greenwood, 1 Str. 129. cited and approved by Lord Loughborough, C. J., and by Gould, J. in Trelawnay v. Thomas, 1 H. Bl. 307. S. P. by Perryn B. in Newland's case, 1 Leach Cr. C. 353.

(2) Case of the Amitie, Villeneuve, 5 Robinson, Adm. Rep. 344. n.

---

as he usually did in such cases, although he was no way bound to do it, but should be governed merely by his general practice and principle;" was held a competent witness, his interest not being fixed or certain, but vague and not amounting even to an ideal or honorary obligation to pay; and, (the court add,) it has been ruled, that even such an obligation does not go to the competency of the witness, *Gilpin* v. *Vincent*, 9 *Johns. Rep.* 219.. So, in an action for a penalty against a member of a religious society or sect called shakers, for harbouring a slave, a member of that society is a competent witness for the defendant, although the members hold all things in common, and have a partnership interest in all their concerns as a religious community; for, that partnership cannot extend to the case of a penalty forfeited by either of the members, for a violation of a penal statute. *Wells* v. *Lane*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 462.

(*a*) The current of authority in this country is against the competency of the witness. It has been held in a late case in Virginia, that a witness considering himself interested, was incompetent. *Richardson's Exr.* v. *Hunt*, 2 *Mun.* 148. And in Massachusetts, that a witness who relies on a gratuitous promise from the plaintiff to pay him part of the sum in controversy, was incompetent. *Plumb* v. *Whiting*, 5 *Mass. Rep.* 518. The same principle appears to be sanctioned by the Supreme Court of the state of New-York. *Trustees of Lansingburgh* v. *Willard*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 428. In the last cited case this rule is established: If a witness be called, and declares himself interested on the side of the party who calls him, and his interest be so circumstanced that he cannot be releas-

before the High Court of Admiralty, an objection was made to the evidence of a witness, who had acknowledged in his answer, "that he could not say he was not interested, inasmuch as he conceived he would be entitled to share, if his vessel should be pronounced a joint captor, though he had signed a release:" on the other side it was contended, that as he was clearly not interested, the effect of his impression was no more an objection in this case, than in those in which the expectation depended only on the bounty of the parties. But Sir William Scott rejected the evidence, observing, "he had always understood the distinction to be, that if the witness says only that he expects to share from the bounty of the captors, he is not disqualified or rendered incompetent, whatever may be the deduction of credit to which he is exposed. But if he thinks himself entitled in law, he acts under an impression of interest, which renders him incompetent, however erroneous that opinion may be."

Having shown what is not such an interest in the event of the suit, as will disqualify a witness from giving evi-

---

ed by the party calling him, in such case he ought not to be sworn, though in strictness he is not interested; but if his ideal interest be against the party calling him, who will run the risk of the bias on the mind of the witness, then he ought to be sworn. In a case in which the witness on his voire dire said, that he expected a compensation from the plaintiff's generosity, if he recovered, he was rejected. *M'Veaugh* v. *Goods*, 1 *Dall.* 62. cited and approved, 2 *Dall.* 50. But in a case in Vermont, in which a person who considered himself interested was offered as a witness, the court said, that if the witness had considered himself to be interested, and any undue bias had been created from this consideration, it was to be presumed, that it would be removed upon his being informed by the court that he was not interested: if, however, he had unhappily contracted any prejudice from a supposed interest, too obstinate to be removed by this suggestion of the court, the jury would consider it in forming an opinion of his credibility. *State* v. *Clark*, 2 *Tyler* 278.

dence, we now proceed to inquire what is such an interest as will disqualify him.

If the witness can avail himself of the verdict, so as to give it in evidence in support of his own claims, or if the *verdict can be used in evidence against him, in case the * 44
party, for whom he is called as witness, should fail in the action, this is a direct and immediate interest in the event of the suit (*a*), which will render him incompetent (1). Thus where a right of common is claimed by custom, one who claims under the same custom cannot be a witness in support of the claim, as he might afterwards use the verdict in his own cause to establish a similar customary right for himself (2). It may perhaps be said, that if he were allowed to be a witness, he could not afterwards use the verdict; for, on the trial of his own cause, if it should appear that he was witness in the former suit, to admit the verdict as evidence for him would be in effect allowing a party to give evidence for himself. The answer to this objection seems to be, that the fact of his having given evidence in the former case would probably be unknown at the time

(1) 3 T. R. 32, 33. 36. 7 T. R. 62. 4 East 582. Bull. N. P. 283. Hockley v. Lamb, 1 Lord Raym. 731.
(2) 1 T. R. 302. 3 T. R. 32.

(*a*) So, a person who has paid taxes to his agent to be paid over to the treasurer of the county, is not a competent witness to prove the payment, in a suit by the treasurer against the agent; for if an action should afterwards be brought respecting these taxes, the verdict might be given in evidence by the principal, to prove that the treasurer had received them. *Hays* v. *Grier*, 4 *Binney* 80. In ejectment, brought to recover lands claimed under the husband, a widow claiming dower in the premises in question is a competent witness, as the verdict cannot be given in evidence in an action of dower brought by her. *Jackson d. Griswold and an other* v. *Bard*, 4 *Johns. Rep.* 230. *Jackson d. Vandusen* v. *Vandusen*, 5 *Johns. Rep.* 144. *Den d. Beatty* v. ——, *Tayl.* 9. 6 *Binney* 505. 507. Et vide *Porter* v. *M'Clure*, 1 *Hayw.* 360. *Jacobson* v. *Fountain*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 170. 176. *Bridge* v. *M'Lane et al.* 2 *Mass. Rep.* 520. *Spitty* v. *Bowens*, *Peake's Cases* 53.

of the second suit; and, even if that fact should be fully proved, yet it would be presumed, that he was disinterested, and then the verdict might perhaps be evidence for him, upon the same principle which allows the depositions of a witness in a suit in equity, to be evidence for him on a bill of revivor brought by the witness himself (3). A commoner, then, is not competent to support a custom, under which he himself claims. So in an action on the case by a commoner against the defendant, for not repairing his fences contiguous to a common, where one of the points in issue was, whether the defendant was liable to repair by reason of his occupation, it has been determined that other persons, who claimed a right of pasture over the same common, were not competent witnesses for the plaintiff (4), because the record would be evidence for another commoner, that the occupier of the adjacent land was bound to repair this fence; and though the plaintiff in that case claimed a right of common by prescription, in right of a
* 45 particular messuage, *still the other commoners, by whatever title they might claim, would have a common interest in casting the burden of the repair of this individual fence upon the occupier of the adjacent land. So, where the question is, whether in a particular parish or vill certain things are generally exempted from tithes, or subject only to a modus, no persons who would be subject to tithes, if the parson's claim were to be allowed, can give evidence in support of the modus or exemption (1). So, where a defendant in an action of trespass justifies under a custom in the parish for out-going tenants to take the away-going crop, he cannot call as witness an occupier of land, who insists upon the same right for himself. But where the issue does not affect any common right, but is merely on a right of common claimed by prescription as belonging to the estate of A, one who claims a prescriptive right of

(3) Goss v. Tracy, 1 P.Wms. 288. 2 Vern. 699. S. C. Haws v. Hind, 2 Atk. 615.

(4) Anscomb v. Shore, 1 Taunt. 261.

(1) Ld. Clanricard v. Ly. Denton, 1 Gwill. 360. Gilb. Ev. 113.

common in right of his own estate may be a witness (2); for though A may have such a right of common, it does not follow that B has, nor would the verdict in the action of A be evidence in B's action (*a*).

(2) Harvey v. Collison, MS. R. 392. Bull. N. P. 283. case stated 1 Sel. N. P. 449. 1 T.

(*a*) In an action of trespass quare clausum fregit the defendants justified under a right of fishery, in the locus in quo, in themselves, in common with the other inhabitants of Staten-Island, and on the trial offered one Anow as a witness to that fact. It was objected that the witness being an inhabitant of the island, was incompetent on the ground of interest, and he was rejected by the judge. The witness then offered to the plaintiff a release of all his right, which the plaintiff refused to accept. He then offered a release to an inhabitant of the island, for the use of all the others except himself; but the judge was of opinion that he was still an incompetent witness. On a motion for a new trial, the court held that the witness was properly rejected. Thompson, J. in delivering the opinion of the court says:—This witness was, I think, properly rejected. A commoner is inadmissible to prove a right of common, unless the common be claimed by prescription, in right of a *particular estate*. The reason of the rule is, that in the case of *customary commoners*, a verdict in an action for or against one, is evidence for or against another claiming in the same right. The witness was therefore directly interested in the event of the suit. Nor could the release offered by the witness, remove the objection; since it could pass no right to the plaintiff, nor extinguish any interest which the witness had. Should he have exercised the right of fishing at any time afterwards, no person could have taken advantage of this release. The right belonged to the witness or other persons, not in their individual capacity, but as *inhabitants of Staten-Island*. The right set up by the defendants, if it existed at all, depended on residence exclusively. And although the witness might bind himself by covenant not to exercise this right, he could not assign or release it, as it was local and personal. If the acceptance of the release would have removed the interest, it is well and rationally settled, that in such case, the witness having done every thing in his power to render himself competent, the obstinacy of the opposite party

"It is no good objection to a witness, says Ch. B. Gilbert (3), that he has common *by cause of vicinage* in the lands in question, for this is no interest in the land, but only an excuse for trespass; and let who will recover the lands, the whole right of common remains, so that he is certainly indifferent in point of interest between the two contenders." However, this position may perhaps be doubted, as the rule is now clearly established, that a witness, who can use the verdict in an action brought either by or against himself, is not competent; and since common *by cause of vicinage* is in the nature of common appendant, and implies immemorial usage of intercommoning, it is presumed, that a verdict, finding the existence of such an usage, would be evidence for the witness, if he
*46 were to *justify under the same usage in an action of trespass. It may be observed, that Ch. B. Gilbert does not once mention the power of using the verdict as a criterion for determining whether the witness is incompetent; so undefined at that time was the rule of evidence on this subject.

Persons liable to the costs of the action have an immediate interest in the event, and therefore are not competent witnesses (*a*). For the same reason, the defendants' bail are not competent to give evidence for their principal (1), because they are immediately answerable in case of a verdict against the defendant (*b*). So, in an action against a sheriff for a false return, the sheriff's officer, who has given security for the due execution of the process, is not a

(3) Gilb. Ev. 109. (1) 1 T. R. 164.

---

shall not prevent his being examined. *Jacobson v. Fountain & others*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 170.

(*a*) *Vansant* v. *Boileau*, 1 *Binney* 444. So, a person who has given a bond to indemnify the plaintiff from the costs of the suit, is incompetent. *Butler* v. *Warren*, 11 *Johns. Rep.* 57.

(*b*) It is the practice for the court to discharge the bail, upon application, when he is wanted as a witness for the defendant. *Irwin* v. *Caryell*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 407.

competent witness, to prove that he endeavoured to make the arrest (2). So, in an action by an infant plaintiff, his prochein amy or guardian are not competent witnesses for him, as they are liable to costs (3). So, in an action against a master, for the negligence of his servant, the servant is not a competent witness to disprove his own negligence; for the verdict may be given in evidence, in a subsequent action by the master against the servant, as to the quantum of the damages, though not as to the fact of the injury (4). So, in an action of assumpsit for goods sold and delivered, the plaintiff having proved the sale of the goods to the defendant and one J. S. who were partners in trade, Lord Kenyon held that J. S. could not be a witness for the defendant, to prove that the goods were sold to himself, and that the defendant was not concerned in the purchase except as his servant; for, said Lord Kenyon, by discharging the defendant he benefits himself, as he will be liable to pay a share of the costs to be recovered by the plaintiff (5) (*a*). So, in an action by an indorsee against the *acceptor of a bill of exchange, which had been accepted for the accommodation of the drawer, the drawer is not a competent witness for the defendant to prove that the holder took the bill for an usurious consideration (*b*). This was lately determined in the case of Jones v. Brooke (1). The Court of Common Pleas there held, that the witness was interested to defeat the action; for, if the holder should succeed against the

*47

(2) Powell v. Hord, 2 Ld. Raym. 1411.; 1 Str. 650. S. C. 3 Camp. 523.

(3) James v. Hatfield, 1 Str. 548. Hopkins v. Neal, 2 Str. 1026. Gilb. Ev. 107.

(4) Green v. New R. Company, 4 T. R. 589. Martin v. Henrickson, 2 Ld. Raym. 1007. Miller v. Falconer, 1 Campb. 251. 15 East 474. 3 Campb. 516.

(5) Goodacre v. Breame, Peake N. P. C. 174.

(1) 4 Taunt. 464. Maundrel v. Kennet, 1 Campb. 408. See also Trelawny v. Thomas, 1 H. Bl. 306. and Ball v. Bostock, 1 Str. 575. as to the incompetency of witnesses liable to costs.

(*a*) Vide *Young* v. *Bairner*, 1 *Esp.* 103.

(*b*) Vide *Cowles* v. *Wilcox*, 4 *Day* 108.

acceptor, the acceptor would not only have a right of action against the drawer for the principal sum, but also for all damages, which as acceptor he might sustain in being sued upon the bill; the drawer of an accommodation bill being bound to indemnify the acceptor against the consequences of his acceptance for the drawer's accommodation (*a*).

(*a*) So, in an action on a policy of insurance to recover for a loss by barratry, Lord Kenyon held that the captain was an incompetent witness to disprove the fact of barratry, as by defeating the plaintiff's action he would discharge himself from his liability over to the underwriter. *Bird* v. *Thompson*, 1 *Esp.* 337. And, on the other hand, if the witness by charging the defendant, would exonerate himself from a liability, he is incompetent. *Rotheroe et al.* v. *Elton*, *Peake* 84. *Sheldon* v. *Ackley*, 4 *Day* 458. *Emerton* v. *Andrews*, 4 *Mass. Rep.* 653. 2 *Mass. Rep.* 444. Upon the principle that a witness is incompetent, who is interested to defeat the plaintiff's action, because in case the plaintiff recovered he would be liable to the defendant in a suit in which the record in the previous action would be evidence against him, a grantor, who has conveyed land with warranty, is inadmissible in support of his grantee's title. *Jackson d. Caldwell* v. *Hallenback*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 394. *Swift* v. *Dean*, 6 *Johns. Rep.* 523. *Moon* v. *Campbell*, 1 *Mun.* 600. *Abby* v. *Goodrich*, 3 *Day* 433. So, a lessor is incompetent to support the title of his lessee, as in case the defendant were evicted, he would be liable on the implied covenant in the word *demised*. *Smith* v. *Chambers*, 4 *Esp.* 164. So, the vendor of a chattel is not a competent witness, in an action against the vendee, there being an implied warranty of title in every sale of personal property. *Heermance* v. *Vernoy*, 6 *Johns. Rep.* 5. But a grantor without covenant of title or warranty is admissible to prove the title of the grantee. *Busby* v. *Greenslate*, 1 *Str.* 445. So, a grantor who has warranted merely against persons claiming under himself, is a competent witness for the grantee against a party not claiming under the witness. *Twambly* v. *Henley*, 4 *Mass. Rep.* 441. *Lessee of Gratz* v. *Ewalt*, 2 *Binney* 95. *Lessee of Cain* v. *Kinderson*, *Id.* 108. *Lessee of Henry* v. *Morgan*, *Id.* 500. *Lessee of Sweitzer* v. *Meese & others*, 6 *Binney* 500. And a grantor, with warranty, is a competent

Upon the same principle it has been determined, that, on an appeal against an order of removal, if the appellants prove a settlement in a third parish, the rated inhabitants of that parish are not competent witnesses for the respondents to disprove it; as the confirmation of the order of removal would be conclusive evidence for the inhabitants of the third parish, that the settlement of the pauper was at that time in the appellant parish (2). It would indeed be quite as conclusive in favour of any other parish in the kingdom; so that the proposed witness had a greater interest in the question than any other person, only in proportion as there was a greater probability, that, if the appellants failed in this appeal, they would afterwards remove the pauper to his parish. Such an objection, however, is now removed by the statute 54 G. 3. c. 170. the 9th section of which enacts, "that no inhabitant or person rated or liable to be rated to any rates of any district, parish, &c., shall be deemed to be by reason thereof an incompetent witness for or against such district, &c., in any matter relating to such rates, or to any order of removal to or from such district, &c., or to the *settlement of the pauper in such district." * 48
Before this provision, it had been decided, that inhabitants would not be incompetent merely from having rateable property in the parish, if it did not appear that the property was actually rated at the time of the appeal; and this, although it was omitted in the rate, for the very purpose of introducing their evidence (1). The Court held, that in order to disqualify a witness, there must be an actual existing interest at the time, not merely one that is expectant and contingent; and that, by taking the witness off the rate, his immediate interest was so far taken away, that it

(2) R. v. Terrington, 15 East 471. v. Little Lumley, 6 T. R. 157. R.
(1) R. v. Prosser, 4 T. R. 17. R. v. Kirdford, 2 East 561.

---

witness in an action of trespass by the grantee, although the defendant justifies under a right of freehold. *Van Nuys* v. *Terhune*, 3 *Johns. Cas.* 82.

could not render him incompetent, whatever objections might still be made against his credibility (*a*).

In an action of ejectment, the tenant in possession, upon whom an ejectment has been served, is not a competent witness in support of the title of the defendant under whom he holds (*b*); for he is liable to the mesne profits, and the verdict in ejectment would be evidence against him in an action to recover them (2). So a witness, to whom the lessor of the plaintiff has agreed to demise the lands in question, in case

(2) Bourne v. Turner, 1 Str. 632. Doe d. Forster v. Williams, Cowp. 621.

(*a*) But it has been held that a parishioner who had property which was rated not in his own, but in his son's name, for the purpose of making him a witness, was incompetent to prove the pauper's settlement in another parish. *R.* v. *Killerby*, 10 *East's Rep.* 292. In an action of debt on a bastardy bond to the overseers of the poor of the town of New-Windsor, it was held that the liability of a witness, on the part of the plaintiff, to be rated for the support of the poor of the town of New-Windsor, was too remote and contingent an interest to render him incompetent. *Falls & Smith* v. *Belknap*, 1 *Johns. Rep.* 486. So, where a qui tam action is brought before a justice of the peace to recover a penalty, the one half of which, when recovered, would go to the support of the poor of the town of which the justice is an inhabitant, this is not such an interest in the cause as will render the justice incompetent to try it. *Corwein* v. *Hames*, 11 *Johns. Rep.* 76. Nor is it an objection against a witness for the plaintiff, that the penalty, when recovered, is to be appropriated to the support of the poor of a town in which he is an inhabitant paying taxes for that purpose. *Bloodgood* v. *Overseers of Jamaica*, 12 *Johns. Rep.* 285.

(*b*) He is incompetent to show that himself and not the defendant was tenant in possession; for he has an immediate interest in preventing a recovery, for the purpose of protecting his own possession; this seems to be considered a question *sui generis*, partly an interest in the question and partly an interest in the event: and it is one of those cases in which reason and sound policy lead to the exclusion of the witness, as from the nature of the fact there can be no inconvenience in requiring other proof, which it must always be in the power of the party to produce. *Brant d. Van Cortlandt & others* v. *Dyckman*, 1 *Johns. Cas.* 275. *Jackson d. Van Den Bergh* v. *Trusdell*, 12 *Johns. Rep.* 246. post 52.

he shall recover them by the verdict in ejectment, would not be competent to give evidence against the defendant; because, in an action for the non-performance of that agreement, the verdict would be evidence for him to prove the fact of the lands having been recovered. To this effect Ch. B. Gilbert has laid it down (3), that if a man promise a witness, that in case he recover the lands he shall have a lease of them for so many years, this excludes the evidence, for then the witness would have a fixed and certain advantage by the event of the verdict. So a witness has been rejected, who, if the plaintiff failed in the action, was to repay a sum of money in his hands belonging to the plaintiff, but was not to repay any part of it, if the plaintiff suc- *ceeded (1) (*a*). And in the case of Forrester v. Pigou (2), * 49
an action on a policy of insurance, where the defendant called another underwriter as witness, who in his examination on the voire dire said, he had paid the loss to the plaintiff upon an undertaking, that he was to be repaid in the event of this action failing, and that he had since received a letter from the plaintiff promising to return the money in that event, Lord Ellenborough, C. J. on the trial rejected the witness. On a motion afterwards for a new trial on account of this rejection, the Court sent the case to be retried, for the purpose of ascertaining more particularly the time when the undertaking was made to the witness; but on that occasion Lord Ellenborough said, "if a person, who is under no obligation to become a witness for either of the parties to the suit, choose to pay his debt beforehand, upon a condition that it is to be determined by the event of that suit, he becomes as much interested in the event as if he were a party to a consolidation rule."

The rule, that a witness is not competent, if the verdict can be given in evidence either for or against him in a

(3) Gilb. Ev. 108. citing a dictum of Twisden, J. in 1 Mod. 21.

(1) Fotheringham v. Greenwood, 1 Str. 129.

(2) 1 Maule & Sel. 9.

(*a*) Vide *Oxen* v. *Mann*, 2 *Day* 399.

future suit, is of all the rules on this subject the most comprehensive, and at the same time the most accurately defined. And if this were the single criterion for ascertaining whether the witness is incompetent, the question of interest, which now is often a question of difficulty, would be greatly narrowed. Lord Kenyon seems disposed to consider this rule as the only true test of competency. In the case of Bent v. Baker (3), he says, "it is to be considered, what is the question put to a witness on his voire dire? It is, is he really interested in the cause? Sometimes indeed, the counsel enter into the detail, and ask *how* he is interested? But the general question involves in it all the others, and amounts to this, whether the record in that cause will affect his interest?" Then again he says, "I think the principle is this, if the proceedings in the
* 50 *cause cannot be used for him, he is a competent witness, although he may have wishes upon the subject." And Mr. Justice Buller in the same case says, "The true line I take to be this, is the witness to gain or lose by the event of the cause? Now this witness could not gain or lose by the event of this suit, because the verdict could not be evidence either for or against him in any other suit (*a*)." However, it will appear from a variety of cases, that witnesses have been considered incompetent on account of interest, although the proceedings in the suit could never be used in evidence either for or against them.

On the subject of interested witnesses, Ch. B. Gilbert lays down the rule thus (1), "the law looks upon a witness as interested, where there is a certain benefit or disadvantage to the witness attending the consequence of the cause one way." Mr. Justice Buller adopts the same rule (2). So, in the case of the King v. Prosser (3), where the question was, whether, on an appeal against a rate, parishioners,

(3) 3 T. R. 32. and see 7 T. R. 62.
(1) Gilb. Ev. 106, 7.
(2) Bull. N. P. 284.
(3) 4 T. R. 20.

(*a*) 2 *Johns. Cas.* 236. 5 *Johns. Rep.* 257. 1 *Hen. & Mun.* 164, 165. 6 *Binney* 319. 4 *Johns. Rep.* 302.

who had rateable property but were not actually rated, were competent witnesses in support of the rate, the same learned judge expressed himself thus: "I take the rule to be this; if the witness can derive no benefit from the cause before the Court, (meaning evidently from the context, no *immediate* benefit,) he is competent." And it appears to be established by a variety of cases, that a certain direct and immediate interest will disqualify, although it may happen that the verdict in the cause cannot be evidence, either for or against the witness in any future suit concerning that interest. The following examples may be cited to illustrate this general rule.

1. Rated parishioners were always considered incompetent, before the late act of parliament (4), to give evidence for their parish in appeals against orders of removal, on *the ground that they were directly and immediately interested in the event of the proceeding, by which the maintenance of the pauper and the costs of the appeal might be fixed upon their parish, and have the effect of increasing their proportion of the rates (1). *51

2. A devisee, who takes an interest under a will, is not competent to speak to the testator's sanity, in an action of ejectment by another devisee against the heir at law (*a*).

3. A bankrupt is not a competent witness in an action by his assignees to prove property in himself or a debt due to himself (2), or in any other manner to increase the fund (*b*). Nor can he prove his own act of bankruptcy, or the petitioning creditor's debt, or any other part necessary to

(4) St. 54. G. 3. c. 170. § 9.
(1) R. v. Prosser, 4 T. R. 19. R. v. South Lynn. 5 T. R. 667. R. v. Kirdford, 2 East 561.
(2) Ewens v. Gold, Bull. N. P. 43.

(*a*) But a tenant, under the devisee, of part of the estate devised, is competent to prove that the testator was *non compos* at the time of executing the will. *Jackson d. Woodhull* v. *Rumsey*, 3 *Johns. Cas.* 234.

(*b*) Sed vide *M'Ewen* v. *Gibbs et al.* 4 *Dall.* 137.

support the commission, not even after obtaining a certificate, and executing a release of his share in the surplus; for if the commission is not good, the certificate and all the proceedings are void, and the bankrupt will be liable again to his debts, from which the certificate would discharge him (3). For the same reason he cannot be questioned as to any antecedent act of bankruptcy, either in his examination in chief or in his cross examination (4). And on a second commission of bankruptcy, a certificated bankrupt cannot be a witness for the assignees under that commission, unless he has paid 15 shillings in the pound, for in the event of his not making that payment under the second commission, his future effects are liable (5).

4. A creditor of a bankrupt is not competent to increase the fund, out of which he may receive a dividend (*c*). He cannot therefore give any evidence to deprive the bankrupt
* 52 of *his allowance (1). And the petitioning creditor is not a competent witness to prove the commission regularly sued out; because he enters into a bond to the Lord Chancellor conditioned to establish the several facts, upon which the

(3) Cross v. Fox, 2 H. Bl. 279. n. (a); Flower v. Herbert, Ib. Field v. Curtis, 2 Str. 829. Chapman v. Gardner, 2 H. Bl. 279. Hoffman v. Pitt, 5 Esp. N. P. C. 22.

(4) Wyatt v. Wilkinson, 5 Esp. N. P. C. 187; Elsom v. Brailey, MS. case in 1 Selw. N. P. 239.

(5) St. 5 G. 2. c. 30. § 9. Kennet v. Greenwollers, Peake N. P. C. 3.

(1) Shuttleworth v. Bravo, 1 Str. 507.

(*c*) *Phœnix* v. *Assignees of Ingraham*, 5 *Johns. Rep.* 427. It is a general rule of evidence that if the effect of the witness's testimony, will be to create or increase a fund in which he will be entitled to participate, he is incompetent. 5 *Johns. Rep.* 258. *Innis* v. *Miller*, 2 *Dall.* 50. *White* v. *Derby*, 1 *Mass. Rep.* 239. *Austin* v. *Bradley*, 2 *Day* 466. *Temple's Executor* v. *Ellett's Executrix*, 2 *Mun.* 452. And it has been held that a witness holding an order from the plaintiff or his agent, the amount of which was to be paid out of the sum which might be recovered in the action, was interested in the event of the suit, although the agent had not accepted the order, and the plaintiff was at all events responsible to the witness for the amount. *Peyton* v. *Hallett*, 1 *Caines' Rep.* 364.

validity of the commission depends, and to cause it to be effectually executed (2) (*a*). But another creditor who has not proved his debt under the commission, is competent to support the commission, though not to increase the estate (3). There is in this case no immediate or certain benefit. It may be as advantageous for the creditor to be allowed to sue his debtor as a solvent person, as to receive a dividend under the commission.

5. In an action of trespass against a sheriff, where the question was, whether goods, which had been taken in execution in a suit against A. B., belonged to him or to the Plaintiff, A. B. was not allowed to be witness for the defendant to prove the goods his property, since he would have been discharged from his debt in case of a verdict for the defendant (4) (*b*).

6. In an action of ejectment, where the plaintiff had made out a prima facie case against the defendant as tenant in possession, the Court of Common Pleas held that a witness called on the part of the defendant was not competent to prove himself the real tenant (*c*), and that the defendant was only his bailiff; for the verdict would have the effect of turning him out immediately; it was therefore an immediate interest, and outweighed the remoter effect of his subjecting himself by his testimony to an action of ejectment and trespass for mesne profits (5).

If there is a direct interest in the event of the suit, it will make the witness incompetent, however small and in-

(2) Green v. Jones, 2 Camp. 411.
(3) Williams v. Stevens, 2 Camp. 301.
(4) Bland v. Ansley, 2 New Rep. 331.
(5) Doe d. Jones v. Wilde, 5 Taunt. 183.

(*a*) In the case in the text the *assignees* of the bankrupt were plaintiffs; but it has been held, in a real action in which the tenant derived his title under a sale from the assignee of a bankrupt, that the petitioning creditor was a competent witness to prove his own debt upon which the commission of bankruptcy was awarded. *Farrington* v. *Farrington*, 4 *Mass. Rep.* 237.

(*b*) Vide ante 47 n. (*c*) Vide ante 48 n.

*considerable the degree of interest may be. Thus, in an action of trespass, where the question was, whether a corporation, which had enclosed part of a common, had left sufficiency for the commoners, a freeman was considered incompetent to prove the affirmative (1), because the rent must have been received for the use of the corporation; though it was admitted that the amount of the rent was exceedingly small. Hence it appears that a person who loses or gains the smallest sum by the event of a suit, whatever may be his rank, fortune, or character, is as incompetent to give evidence, as one who may be interested to the amount of thousands. This is the unavoidable consequence of the general rule. If interest is allowed to disqualify in any case, it must in all; as it is impossible by any scale to measure the different effects which it may have on different minds (*a.*)

If the witness has an interest inclining him to each of the parties, so as upon the whole to make him indifferent, he will be competent to give evidence for either party (*b*). Thus in an action of assumpsit for money paid to the use of the defendants who were ship-owners, Lord Kenyon admitted the captain to prove that he had received the money

(1) Burton v. Hinde, 5 T. R. 174.*

* See R. v. Mayor and Commonalty of London, 2 Lev. 231., R. v. Carpenter, 2 Show. 47., and case of City of London, 1 Ventr. 351. *contra.* In these cases freemen were admitted to be witnesses on account of the minuteness of their interest, against the opinion of Jones, J. The law of the case in 2 Lev. (where the point is precisely the same as in the other two cases,) has been doubted by Mr. Justice Buller; see Bull. N. P. 290.

(*a*) And the witness cannot testify as to any point arising on the trial of the cause, such as the service of notice on the defendant, to produce certain papers at the trial. *Butler* v. *Warren*, 11 *Johns. Rep.* 57.

(*b*) *Jackson d. Caldwell* v. *Hallenback*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 394. *Bailey & Bogert* v. *Ogdens*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 420. *M'Leod* v. *Johnston*, 4 *Johns. Rep.* 126. *Baring* v. *Reeder*, 1 *Hen. & Mun.* 164. *Cushman* v. *Loker*, 2 *Mass. Rep.* 106.

from the plaintiff for the defendant's use: for he stood indifferent between the parties, and, whichever way the verdict might go, he was equally answerable (2) (*c*). So in an action of covenant for rent, where the point in issue was, whether A. B., whose title both the plaintiff and defendant admitted, had demised the premises first to the *plaintiff or to a third person, A. B. was a competent witness to prove that fact; for the verdict could not be given in evidence in any future action either by or against the witness, being a record between other parties; and it appeared to be indifferent to him, whether he had the one or the other as his tenant (1) (*a*). So where one partner drew a bill in the partnership firm, and gave it in payment to a separate creditor in discharge of his own debt, the Court of King's Bench held that, in an action by such creditor against the acceptor, either of the partners might be called on the part of the defendant to prove that the partner, who drew the bill, had no authority to draw it in the name of the firm; and that the bankruptcy of the partners would not vary the question as to the competency of the witness (2). In this case, the partner who drew the bill would have been liable to the plaintiff to the amount of his debt, if the plaintiff had failed in the action, and if the plaintiff had succeeded, he would have been liable to the defendant the acceptor; and with respect to the other partner, though he would have been liable to the defendant, if the plaintiff

* 54

(2) Evans v. Williams, 7 T. R. 481. n. (c). Ilderton v. Atkinson, 7 T. R. 480. Shuttleworth v. Stephens, 1 Campb. 407.

(1) Bell v. Harwood, 3 T. R. 308. See Serle v. Serle, 2 Roll. Abr. 685., tit. Trial, (G,) cited Gilb. Ev. 109.

(2) Ridley v. Taylor, 13 East 175.

(*c*) So, a master of a vessel, who had drawn a bill on his owners for the necessary expenditures of the vessel, is a competent witness in an action by the payee against the drawer; for he is alike liable to both parties. *Millward* v. *Hallett*, 2 *Caines' Rep.* 77.

(*a*) In an action of trover by a sheriff who levied on goods without notice of any rent being in arrear, against the landlord who had distrained the same goods, the tenant was held to be a competent witness. *Alexander* v. *Mahon*, 11 *Johns. Rep.* 185.

recovered, he would have had his remedy over against his joint partner.

In the case of Ilderton v. Atkinson (3), where the question was in an action of assumpsit, whether A. B., who had received money due from the defendant to the plaintiff, received it in the character of agent for the plaintiff, the Court of King's Bench held that A. B. might be called for the defendant to prove his agency, as he was liable either to pay the money received or to refund it to the defendant; and though it was objected, that he had a stronger interest to give evidence in favour of the defendant than on the side of the plaintiff, (since, if he had received the money under a misrepresentation of his own character, the defendant might recover from him the costs of the action then depend-
* 55 *ing as well as the money,) the Court held that the possibility of such a remote interest did not make the witness incompetent. Upon the authority of this case, the case of Birt v. Kirshaw (1) was decided; there the Court of King's Bench were of opinion, that the indorser of a note, who had received money from the drawer to take it up, was a competent witness in an action by the indorsee against the drawer to prove on the part of the defendant, that he had satisfied the note; since he would be liable on the note to the plaintiff, if the defendant succeeded, or to the defendant in an action for money had and received, if the plaintiff succeeded; and the Court held, that the witness was not rendered incompetent by the circumstance of his being also liable to the defendant, in the latter case, for the costs of this action in consequence of his non-payment. But in the
Ante 27 recent case of Jones v. Brooke (2), which was an action against the acceptor of a bill accepted for the accommodation of the drawer, the Court of Common Pleas held that the drawer was not a competent witness for the defendant to prove, that the holder received the bill on an usurious consideration; on the ground, that he was bound to indemnify the acceptor against the consequences of an acceptance

(3) 7 T. R. 480.
(1) 2 East 458.
(2) 4 Taunt. 464.

made for his accommodation, and would therefore be liable to the acceptor not only for the principal sum but also for all the damages which he might sustain in being sued upon the bill in this action. The liability to the costs of the action, as appears from several cases before mentioned, is a substantial objection to the competency of a witness; and however indifferent he may be in other respects towards either party, yet if he has incurred such a liability, he has an immediate and direct interest in the event of the suit. In the case of Buckland v. Tankard (3), the Court held that a witness, who might have a remedy by action whether the plaintiff or defendant had a verdict, was nevertheless interested, because under the particular circumstances he would have a greater difficulty in the one case than in the other (*a*) to *enforce that remedy. However this * 56
appears to be the only case which has been decided on such a ground; and from the leading cases on this subject, which rest on the broad ground of interest, such a circumstance may now more properly be considered as having a

(3) T. R. 579.

(*a*) In an action of ejectment in which the defendant claimed under one *Barber*, *Jones* was offered as a witness: it appeared that Jones held a promissory note given by the defendant to Barber, to secure a part of the purchase money of the land, which note had been assigned by Barber to Jones, and which the defendant had paid under an agreement, that in case the plaintiff should recover in the present action, Jones should refund the money and resort to Barber, who was a man of property, for payment: the witness was held incompetent, on the ground that if judgment should be rendered against the defendant, the witness would be obliged immediately to refund the money, while his demand for a similar amount against Barber, might long be postponed, be sought after with great expense, and eventually fail, through Barber's insolvency: the obligation to refund, in the event of a judgment against the defendant, would be *certain;* but the reimbursement by Barber, at best, would be *contingent*. *Owen* v. *Mann*, 2 *Day* 399.

strong influence on the witness, but not as forming any solid objection to his competency.

The objection to a witness on account of his being interested is an objection on the voire dire, and excludes him from giving any kind of evidence for the party who calls him. If the objection prevails, he cannot be examined at all (*a*). The meaning of the rule, which declares that an interested person shall not be witness in courts of justice, must be that he cannot be heard *at all*, as a witness on the side to which his interest inclines him (*b*). Chief Baron Gilbert lays it down, that he is *totally* excluded from all attestation, from his supposed want of integrity. Thus on an indictment against a township for not repairing a highway, a parishioner seems not to be a competent witness for the prosecution, even to prove the road to be a common highway; though it may be said, that to such an extent he charges himself, and his testimony is against his own interest. The answer to this is, that *on the trial of this indictment* his evidence has not that tendency; for without the proof of that fact the indictment cannot be

---

(*a*) A witness is competent when called on to testify, by a party against whom he is interested; or, in other words, a witness is competent when swearing against his own interest, *ante* 34. *Birt* v. *Wood*, 1 *Esp.* 20. *Jackson d. Youngs and others* v. *Vredenburgh*, 1 *Johns. Rep.* 159. *Munay* v. *Wilson*, 1 *Binney* 531. *Wells* v. *Tucker*, 3 *Binney* 366. *Braxton's Admx.* v. *Hilyard*, 2 *Mun.* 49. And where a witness is produced by the party against whom he is interested, the other party may cross-examine him as to all matters pertinent to the issue on trial. *Webster* v. *Lee*, 5 *Mass. Rep.* 334.

(*b*) See an application of this rule, *ante* 53, *n.* (*a*). But a witness competent to answer any questions ought not to be rejected generally. 3 *Term Rep.* 35, 36; thus, if a suit be brought for distinct matters of account or causes of action, the witness may testify as to those in which he is not interested. *Smith and others* v. *Carrington and others*, 4 *Cranch* 62. A contrary doctrine, however, has been expressly laid down by the Supreme Court of the state of New-York. *Gage* v. *Stewart*, 4 *Johns. Rep.* 293.

sustained, and the witness by giving such evidence is supporting a prosecution, which, if it succeed, would have the effect of discharging him and the rest of the parishioners. So in an action of ejectment, a witness, who admits, that he is to have a lease of the premises, in case the defendant is turned out of possession by the ejectment, is as incompetent to prove the defendant in possession of the premises, as to prove any other material fact necessary for the support of the action (*c*).

*Sect. II. * 57

Of the Rule on the Subject of Interest, considered with reference to the Parties in the Suit.

A party to the suit on record cannot be witness at the trial for himself or for a joint-suitor against the adverse party(1), on account of the immediate and direct interest which he has in the event, either from having a certain benefit or loss, or from being liable to costs (*a*). The party,

(1) 1 Vern. 230. 1 P. Wms. 596. Gilb. Ev. 116.

(*c*) Vide ante 48.

(*a*) 1 *Day* 106. *Haswell* v. *Bussing*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 128. *Sharp* v. *Thatcher*, 2 *Dall.* 77. So, it has been held, that one joint appellee cannot be received as a witness for his co-appellees, either upon his releasing to them his interest in the subject in controversy, or upon *his* or *their* depositing with the clerk a sum of money sufficient to cover the costs. *Cogbill* v. *Cogbill and others*, 2 *Hen. and Mun.* 467. Parties, however, have been permitted to testify, in some of the states, to facts which were necessary to be shown in order to authorize the admission of secondary or inferior evidence: as to prove the death of a subscribing witness, in order to let in evidence of the handwriting. *Douglass's Lessee* v. *Sanderson*, 2 *Dall.* 116. Or that he could not be found on inquiry. *Chase and others* v. *Lincoln*, 3 *Mass. Rep.* 236. So, to prove the loss or destruction of a deed, previous to giving a copy in evidence. *Blanton* v. *Miller*, 1 *Hayw.* 4. *Seekright d. Wright and wife* v. *Bogan*, *Id.* 178. *n. Park* v.

therefore, in whose name an action is brought, cannot be a witness, though he be merely trustee for some other person (2) (*b*); as a prochein amy (*c*) suing for an infant (3). Persons appointed governors and directors of the poor of a parish under an act of parliament, which authorizes them to assess rates on the inhabitants, but in case of appeal makes them liable to costs, to be indemnified out of the parochial fund, are not competent witnesses on the trial of such appeal; as they are liable to costs individually in the first instance (4). But there is no objection, it is said, to the competency of persons, who are party to a suit

(2) Bauerman v. Radenius, 7 T. R. 668.

(3) Clutterbuck v. Lord Huntingtower, 1 Str. 505. James v. Hatfield, 1 Str. 548. Hopkins v. Neal, 2 Str. 1025. Gilb. Ev. 107.

(4) R. v. St. Mary Magdalen, Bermondsey, 3 East 7.

Cocheran and others, *Id.* 410. 2 *Hayw.* 351. But it has been decided in Connecticut that the loss or destruction of a deed was not a preliminary question, but a material and traversable fact, to which a party was incompetent to testify. *Coleman* v. *Wolcott*, 4 *Day* 388. Vide ante 46. 53. *n.*

(*b*) 2 *Day* 404. 2 *Hen. and Mun.* 483. *Beard's Exr.* v. *Cowman's Exr.* 3 *Harris and M'Henry* 152. But it has been held in Pennsylvania, that a nominal party was a competent witness at law, on the ground that there being no court of equity in that state, the assignee or cestuy que trust is compelled to bring his action in the name of the assignor or trustee, and cannot file a bill in his own name; and as regards costs, they constantly look to the person beneficially interested. *Steele* v. *Phœnix Insurance Company*, 3 *Binney* 306. *M'Clenachan* v. *Scott*, 2 *Dall.* 172. *n.* *M'Ewen* v. *Gibbs*, 4 *Dall.* 137. *Drum* v. *Lessee of Simpson*, 6 *Binney* 478. In South Carolina, it seems that a nominal plaintiff is a competent witness. *Canty* v. *Sumter*, 2 *Bay* 93.

(*c*) So, an executor, either plaintiff or defendant, is incompetent. *Vansant* v. *Boileau and another*, 1 *Binney* 444. *Heckert* v. *Haine*, 6 *Binney* 16. But an administrator dura ante minore etate is a competent witness in an action against the executor, either at law or in equity; for such administrator cannot sue, nor can he be called to an account by any but the executor. *Fotherby* v. *Pate*, 3 *Atk.* 604.

in a corporate capacity, and consequently not individually liable to costs, and who are free from all interest in the question (*d*). Thus, in an action against the governors of the Foundling Hospital for the amount of work done by the plaintiff, Lord Kenyon admitted several of the governors to prove the badness and insufficiency of the work (5).

An exception to the general rule is stated by Rolle, C. J., in the case of an action against a hundred on the statute of Winton (6), where the plaintiff (the party robbed) may *prove the robbery and the amount of his loss, "from necessity, on default of other proof (1)." And in the case of Bennet v. Hundred of Hertford (2), which was an action * 58

(5) Weller v. The Governors of Foundl. Hosp. Peake's N. P. C. 153. And see Barrett v. Gore and another, 3 Atk. 401.

(6) St. 13 Ed. 1. c. 1.

(1) 2 Roll. Ab. 686. Bull. N. P. 289.

(2) 2 Roll. Ab. 686. Vin. Ab. Ev. (I), pl. 34.

(*d*) *Gilpin* v. *Vincent*, 9 *Johns. Rep.* 220. ante 42. *n.* So, the trustees of a pious charitable society are competent witnesses in support of a will under which they take as legatees or devisees in trust for the benefit of the institution. *Nason* v. *Thatcher and others*, 7 *Mass. Rep.* 398. *Cornwell* v. *Isham*, 1 *Day* 35. In England there seems to be no general rule adopted, when members of corporations shall be admitted, or refused to be witnesses, in actions for or against the corporations; but every case stands upon its own circumstances; that is, whether the interest be so valuable as it can be presumed it may occasion partiality in them or not. *Swift's Ev.* 57.

But in Connecticut this general rule has been adopted, that in all cases where the corporations which are of a public nature and comprehend the divisions of the state, such as counties, towns, societies, and school-districts, are parties on record, or interested in the suit, the members of the corporations are competent witnesses: for they are not considered as having a personal but a corporate interest, which ought to go to the credit, and not to the competency; and there are many instances where, if they were excluded, no testimony could be obtained: but with regard to other corporations of a private nature, instituted for special purposes, as banks and turnpike companies, their interest is so direct, and there being no necessity that they should be witnesses, they have not been allowed to testify. *Ibid.* Vide ante 48 *n.*

on the same statute, brought by a carrier for a robbery committed in his absence on his servant, the Court ruled against the opinion of Rolle, C. J., that the plaintiff might prove the amount of the money which he had delivered to his servant. The 15th section of the statute 8 G. 2. c. 16. recites, that in an action against the hundred the person robbed may prove the robbery and the property of which he was robbed. But though the plaintiff may prove the fact of the robbery, yet with respect to matters, which may be proved by other evidence, he is not a competent witness. Thus he cannot give evidence to prove, that the place where he was robbed, is within the hundred against which he has brought the action (3). And though the party robbed, who brought the action, has been allowed to be a witness even in his own cause, yet none of the inhabitants of the hundred were formerly received on behalf of the hundred, however inconsiderable their interest might be (4). But now they are competent witnesses by the statute 8 G. 2. c. 16. s. 15 (*a*).

One other exception appears to be made in the case of an action for a malicious prosecution, where it seems to have been understood, that the evidence, which the defendant himself gave on the trial of the indictment, may under certain circumstances be received in his favour on

(3) Per Page, J. Rep. temp. Hard. 83.

(4) Per Cur. in R. v. Carpenter, 2 Show. 47.

(*a*) In Connecticut the oaths of the parties are admitted, by statute, in actions of book-debt, and in a number of other cases, which see enumerated in *Swift's Ev.* 81—91. So, in an action of book-debt, brought by the wife as administratrix of her husband, she is a competent witness. *Stanton* v. *Bird's Executors*, 3 *Day* 37. And in South Carolina, where usury is set up as a defence, the defendant is a competent witness to prove the usury, unless the plaintiff will deny on oath the truth of what the defendant offers to swear against him. *Luyten* v. *Haygood*, 2 *Bay* 177. In Massachusetts usury may be proved by the oath of the defendant, the suit being between the original debtor and creditor. *Binney* v. *Merchant*, 6 *Mass. Rep.* 190.

the trial of the action. In the case of Johnson v. Browning (5), Lord Holt, C. J. admitted in evidence the oath of the defendant's wife, (who was the only person present at the time of the supposed felony, and who, as the report says, could not herself be a witness,) to prove the felony *committed; "for otherwise, it is said, one that should be robbed would be under an intolerable mischief; if he prosecuted for such robbery and the party should be acquitted, the prosecutor would be liable to an action for a malicious prosecution without the possibility of making a good defence, though the cause of prosecution were ever so pregnant." And Mr. Justice Buller, treating of this action, says (1), "as it may come to be left to a jury, it is advisable for the defendant to give proof of a probable cause, if he be capable of doing it; and for this purpose proof of the evidence given by the defendant on the indictment is good." * 59

In the case of the Mayor and Commonalty of London (2), and that of the city of London concerning water-bailage (3), the point in issue was, whether the corporation was entitled to certain tolls; in the first case it was ruled by the whole Court, and by three judges in the last, that freemen, (members of the corporation,) might be witnesses in support of the claim, because the tolls would be received for the benefit of the whole corporate body, and the interest of any individual must, therefore, be inconsiderable. But Mr. Justice Buller has doubted the law of the former case (4), and its authority is still further shaken by the case of Burton v. Hinde (5), before mentioned.

Freemen are sometimes admitted as witnesses from necessity, when they would otherwise be objectionable. A case of this kind is mentioned by Mr. Justice Buller (6). "The question being, whether the defendants had a right to be freemen, an alderman was permitted to prove that

(5) 6 Mod. Rep. 216.
(1) Bull. N. P. 14., citing Cobb. v. Car. 1746.
(2) 2 Lev. 231.
(3) 1 Ventr. 351.
(4) Bull. N. P. 290.
(5) 5 T. R. 174. See ante, p. 52.
(6) R. v. Phipps & Archer, Bull. N. P. 289. and see ante p. 40.

they were not freemen, because none but aldermen were privy to the transactions of the corporation in making per-
* 60 *sons free; although it appeared that there were commons belonging to the freemen."

In courts of equity, if a bill is filed for discovery only, and an issue is directed, the plaintiff goes to law, giving the defendant the benefit of his answer (1). And it seems at one time to have been the practice to direct an issue, where a bill was filed for *relief*, and the defendant's answer positively denied the facts stated in the bill, which was supported only by a single witness; and in such cases the defendant's answer was directed to be read at the trial (2). But an issue would not now be directed, where there is merely oath against oath, for the rule in equity is, that if the answer contains a positive denial of the case stated in the bill, and it is contradicted only by a single witness, there cannot be a decree against the defendant (3); it should seem, therefore, that in such a case the answer of the defendant cannot be directed to be read at law. And the Court has refused to make an order to that effect, where the plaintiff's witness was supported by concurring circumstances (4).

As a party to the suit is not suffered to be witness in support of his own interest, so he is never compelled in courts of law to give evidence for the opposite party against himself. Thus, in a question of settlement between two parishes, the rated inhabitants of either parish, being in reality the parties to the proceeding, cannot be compelled by the adverse party to answer against their own interest (5); and their declarations are evidence against themselves (6). But where one of several co-plaintiffs comes forward voluntarily to disprove the defendant's liability to the demand made upon him, he may be admitted with the

(1) See 9 Ves. 282.
(2) Ibbotson v. Rodes, 2 Vern. 554. 3 Atk. 408. Gilb. Ev. 137.
(3) See infra, Ch. VII. Sect. 1.
(4) Only v. Walker, 3 Atk. 407.
(5) R. v. Woburn, 10 East 403. Fenn dem. Pewtriss and another v. Granger, 3 Campb. N. P. C. 177.
(6) R. v. Hardwick, 11 East 579. R. v. Whitley Lower, 1 Maule & Sel. 636.

consent of the *adverse party, though at the same time he defeats the claim of those who jointly sue with him (1). For, if the plaintiff were to make a declaration against his interest out of court, evidence of that declaration would be admissible; and how is the proof less credible, if, with the consent of the defendant, who waives all objection to his testimony, he declares the same thing upon oath at the time of the trial?

A defendant cannot regularly be a witness for his co-defendants: but, if no evidence has been produced against him, he is entitled to his discharge, as soon as the opposite party has closed his case (*a*), and may then give evidence for the others (2.) If this were not allowed, great injustice might be done by including witnesses in the process, for the purpose of supporting a false charge. But if there is any, even the slightest evidence against him, he cannot be discharged before the rest, and the case must go altogether to the jury (3). So, in trespass against a person, "for that he, together with A. B., &c." committed the wrong complained of, if it appears that A. B. was concerned in the trespass, and that process was sued out against him, and an endeavour made to arrest him, or that the process was lost, he cannot be admitted a witness for the defendant (4); but if nothing is proved against A. B. then he ought to be admitted (5). The following case is put by Ch. Baron Gilbert: "Trespass against A. and B. for two horses—evidence against A. as to one—and the question is, if he may be a witness for B. in relation to the other; and it

(1) Norden and another, v. Williamson, 1 Taunt. 378.

(2) Case of Dymoke and others, Sav. 34. pl. 81. R. v. Bedder and others, 1 Sid. 237. Hawk. b. 2. c. 46. s. 98. Gilb. Ev. 117. Bull. N. P. 285. Case of the Mutineers of the Bounty, cited 1 East 312.

(3) Bull. N. P. 285. Gilb. Ev. 117. Raven and another v. Dunning and another, 3 Esp. N. P. C. 25.

(4) Reazon v. Ewbank, Bull. N. P. 286. Hill v. Fleming, Rep. temp. Hard. 264. Lloyd v. Williams, Ib. 123.

(5) Page v. Crook, Styl. 401. 1 Atk. 452.

(*a*) *Wakely* v. *Hart and others*, 6 *Binney* 316. *Piddock* v. *Brown et al.* 3 *P. Wms.* 288. *State* v. *Shaw*, 1 *Root* 134.

seems, that if it were the same fact, and the trespass committed at the same time and place, he may not be a witness, because he swears to discharge himself; but if it were not the same fact, but two distinct trespasses at different times and *places, arbitrarily joined in the same declaration, then they may be witnesses one for the other, because the oath of one of them has no influence on the fact laid to his charge, but merely goes in discharge of the other (1)."

*62

In a case where one of the defendants on an indictment for an assault submitted and was fined, and paid the fine, Pratt, C. J. allowed him to be witness for another defendant, considering the trial as at an end with respect to him(2). But on a joint indictment against several for a misdemeanor, a defendant who suffers judgment by default, cannot be a witness either for the others (3) or against them (4) (*a*). And in an action on a joint contract against two defendants where one let judgment go by default, Lord Kenyon refused to admit him as witness for the other defendant to negative

(1) Gilb. Ev. 118.
(2) R. v. Fletcher, 1 Str. 633.
(3) R. v. Lafone and others, 5 Esp. N. P. C. 155.
(4) Bull. N. P. 285. Chapman v. Graves, 2 Campb. N. P. C. 333. n.

(*a*) So, where a co-defendant in a criminal prosecution was tried separately, another defendant was held incompetent, on the ground of his being a party to the record. *The People* v. *Bill*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 95. and where one of the defendants in an action on a joint contract has obtained his discharge under the bankrupt law, he is an incompetent witness for the other. *Ravenetalt* v. *Dunning and Chilton*, 3 *Esp.* 25. But where process was issued against three joint trespassers, two of whom were taken and the other returned not found, it was held that the defendant who had not been arrested was a competent witness for the other two defendants on the trial of the cause. *Stockham* v. *Jones and others*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 21. So, if the plaintiff go to trial against some of the defendants, without taking any steps to compel the others to plead, they are competent witnesses for their co-defendants. *Wakely* v. *Hart and others*, 6 *Binney* 316.

the contract; for, if negatived as to one, it fails as to the other, and the plaintiff could not make use of the judgment by default against him (5); nor is he a competent witness for the plaintiff; for, if the plaintiff succeeds, he will be entitled to a contribution from the co-defendant, and if the plaintiff fails, he himself will be liable to the whole of the demand (6). It has been held at nisi prius, that a defendant in an action of trover, who suffers judgment by default, may be witness for the co-defendants, as he is not liable to the costs of the issue tried against the other, and is not himself released whatever may be the event of that issue (7) (*b*). If a material witness for a defendant in ejectment is made a co-defendant, his proper course is to let judgment go by default; but if he plead, the Court will not afterwards, upon motion, strike out his name (8). "But in such case," says Mr. Justice Buller, "if he consent to let a verdict be given against him for so much as he is proved to be in possession *of, I see no reason why he should not be a witness for another defendant (1)." *63

Though a plaintiff cannot ordinarily examine a defendant as a witness in actions at common law, though nothing be proved against him, (because he is considered as having waived his testimony by making him a defendant,) yet the rule is much less strict in courts of equity, where defendants, who are made parties to a suit without having any interest (*a*), are allowed to be examined either for the

(5) Brown v. Fox, Exr. Sum. Ass. 1789, MS.

(6) Brown v. Brown and another, 4 Taunt. 752.

(7) Wara v. Haydon and another, 2 Esp. N. P. C. 553. See 2 Campb. N. P. C. 334.

(8) Dormer v. Fortescue, Bull. N. P. 285.

(1) Bull. N. P. 285.

(*b*) Sed quære, for the jury may assess joint damages against all the defendants. Per Tilghman, Ch. J. 6 *Binney* 319. *Bostwick* v. *Lewis*, 1 *Day* 33.

(*a*) So, the guardian of an infant plaintiff, in chancery, may be examined for him, saving all just exceptions, (to be made at the hearing.) *Trustees of Huntington* v. *Nicoll*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 566.

plaintiff, or for their co-defendants (2). Where a witness for the plaintiff is by mistake made a defendant, the court will on motion suffer his name to be struck out of the record even after issue joined, and then he may be examined (3); or, in the case of an information, the attorney-general may enter a *nolle prosequi* as to one of the defendants, and so make him a witness (4).

Sect. III.

Of the Rule on the Subject of Interest, considered with reference to the Husband or Wife of the Party.

As a party on record is not a competent witness, so neither is the husband or wife of the party competent to

(2) Barrett v. Gore and another, 3 Atk. 401. Ambl. 393. 2 Chan. Cas. 214. 1 Ball and Beatty 99.

(3) 1 Sid. 441. Bull. N. P. 285.

(4) Rep. Temp. Hard. 163.

A defendant having no interest in the event of a cause may be examined on the trial of a feigned issue awarded by the chancellor. *Bebee and others* v. *The Bank of New-York*, 1 *Johns. Rep.* 556. 576, 577. But a party in interest cannot be made a witness by being omitted in the bill; thus, where a bill is filed by one partner against another, a third partner who is not made a party, cannot be a witness for the plaintiff, for in a suit for settling the concerns of a partnership, every partner ought to be made a party. *Waggoner* v. *Gray's Administrators*, 2 *Hen. and Mun.* 603. If the evidence of a defendant be sought for the purpose of charging himself, and in contradiction to his interest, there is no legal objection to his competency, if he chooses to testify. In an action against A. B. & C. in relation to a partnership transaction, subsequent to which B. & C. had obtained their discharge under an insolvent law, it was held that B. & C. were competent witnesses to charge A. for if the act of insolvency created a legal bar, they were no longer parties in interest, and no decree could be had against them, and if it were not a legal bar, they were called to charge themselves in connexion with A. and so far from having an interest to support the plaintiff's bill, their interest lay the other way. *Reimsdyck* v. *Kane et al. Rep. of the Circuit Court of the United States for the first Circuit*, 631.

give evidence either for or against the party (5.) No other relation is excluded (6); a father may give evidence for his son, or the son for his father, and though the relation between them may influence his testimony, it will not render him incompetent. The reason for excluding husband and wife from giving evidence, either for or against each other, is founded partly on their identity of interest, partly on a *principle of public policy, which deems it necessary to guard the security and confidence of private life, even at the risk of an occasional failure of justice. They cannot be witness *for* each other, because their interests are absolutely the same; they are not witnesses *against* each other, because it is contrary to the legal policy of marriage. It has been resolved, says Lord Coke (1), that a wife cannot be produced against the husband, as it might be the means of implacable discord and dissention between them, and the means of great inconvenience. Thus, in an action brought by a woman as feme sole, the defendant cannot call the plaintiff's husband to prove her married, thereby to nonsuit her (2). So, where an action is brought by or against the husband, or by the husband and wife jointly in right of the wife, the declarations of the wife are not evidence against him (3). Therefore, in an action of assumpsit brought by the husband for wages earned by his wife, her acknowledgment of having been paid by the defendant is not to be admitted against the husband (4). So, in an action of trespass against a husband and wife, the wife's confession of a trespass committed by her, cannot be given in evidence to affect the husband (5).

* 64

In an action for criminal conversation with the plaintiff's

(5) Co. Lit. 6. b. Hawk. b. 2. c. 46. s. 70. Gilb. Ev. 119. Bull. N. P. 286.

(6) 1 Hale P. C. 303. 2 Hale P. C. 276. Hawk. b. 2. c. 46. s. 76. Bull. N. P. 287. 1 Wils. 332.

(1) Co. Lit. 6. b.

(2) Bentley v. Cook, cited in R. v. Cliviger, 2 T. R. 265. 269.

(3) Winsmore v. Greenbank, Willes, 577. Alban and others v. Pritchett, 6 T. R. 680. Baker v. Morley, Bull. N. P. 28.

(4) Hall v. Hill, 2 Str. 1094.

(5) Per Cur. in Denn v. White and another, 7 T. R. 112.

wife, the wife's letters to the defendant are not evidence for the defendant against the husband, nor is her confession evidence for the husband against the defendant (*a*), but conversations between her and the defendant are evidence against him (6). Evidence of the manner in which the husband and wife used to live together, before her connexion with the defendant, is clearly admissible, for the purpose either of increasing or lowering the damages; and in a case where they necessarily lived apart, being
*65 servants in different *families (1), Lord Kenyon held that the letters of the wife to her husband, which had been written before any suspicion of a criminal intercourse, were evidence to show the affection which subsisted between them; but, on account of the obvious danger of collusion, it ought to be strictly proved, that the letters, which are offered in evidence, were written at a time when the wife was not suspected of misconduct.

In an action brought by a trustee to a marriage-settlement against a sheriff, to recover back the value of certain goods sold by him under an execution against a third person, that person was not admitted to prove, on the part of the plaintiff, that the goods had been conveyed in trust

(6) Bull. N. P. 28. Winsmore v. Greenbank, Willes 577.

(1) Edwards v. Crock, 4 Esp. N. P. C. 39.

(*a*) Where a bill was filed in Chancery, by a husband against his wife to obtain a divorce, and a feigned issue was awarded to try the fact of adultery, and the confessions of the wife were admitted, on the trial, in evidence to prove her guilt, it was held that the confessions of the wife, when connected with other proof, were, in the first instance, admissible; but that if it had appeared, that such confessions were made with a fraudulent design, or by collusion with the husband, in order to obtain a divorce, their effect would be destroyed. *Doe* v. *Roe*, 1 *Johns. Cas.* 25. But it has been held, in Massachusetts, on a libel for a divorce, that the confessions of the guilty party, uncorroborated by other circumstances, were inadmissible to prove the fact of adultery. *Baxter* v. *Baxter*, 1 *Mass. Rep.* 346.

for the separate use of his (the witness's) wife (2). In this case, as his debt would have been discharged by a sufficient execution, his evidence would have been in that respect against his personal interest (3): but, on the other hand, it was the wife's interest to have the property secured for her separate use; and though the action was between third persons, yet it directly affected her interest, the point in issue being, whether the goods belonged to her or to her husband (*a*).

In an action of trover by a carrier for a box, which had been delivered to the defendant by mistake, the plaintiff called the owner's wife to prove what the box contained, but Holt, C. J. refused to hear her testimony, on the ground that the verdict in that action, with oath of what the carrier's witness swore, might be given in evidence to prove the value of the goods in a subsequent action brought by the husband against the carrier (4). And on a prosecution against several persons for a conspiracy, Lord Ellenbo-

(2) Davis v. Dinwoody, 4 T. R. 678.

(3) Bland v. Ansley, 2 New Rep. 331.

(4) Tiley v. Cowling, Ld. Ray. 744. Bull. N. P. 243. But see post Part 2. Ch. 2. Sect. 1.

(*a*) It is evident in *Davis* v. *Dinwoody* ubi supra, the wife of the witness had a direct and immediate interest in preserving to her trustee the property of goods which had been settled to her separate use: it appears however, that where the interest of the husband or wife of the witness is not certain but contingent, such an interest is not sufficient to exclude the witness; post 71 and not. ibid. But, in a case in Pennsylvania, in which a witness who had married the widow of the intestate, was offered for the purpose of invalidating a sale of land, under an order of the Orphan's Court, to supply a deficiency in the personal estate of the intestate, it was held that the witness was incompetent, although he had released his interest of dower in the land in dispute, for notwithstanding his release, his wife would be entitled to dower out of the land after his death. *Lessee of Snyder* v. *Snyder*, 6 *Binney* 483. Yeates, J. dissented, on the ground that the contingency of the wife surviving the husband was too remote to exclude his testimony.

rough, C. J. refused to admit the wife of one of the defen-
* 66 *dants to be a witness for the others : a joint offence being charged, and an acquittal of all the other defendants being a ground of discharge for the husband (1).

This rule of evidence, which has been adopted for the purpose of promoting a perfect union of interests and of securing mutual confidence, is so strictly observed, that even after a dissolution of marriage for adultery the wife is not admitted to give any evidence, which would have been excluded if the marriage had continued (2). Thus one great cause of distrust is removed, by making the confidence, which once subsists, ever afterwards inviolable in courts of law (*a*). In a case (3) before Lord Hardwicke, C. J., he would not suffer a woman to be a witness, though her husband consented. "The rule, he said, is for the peace of families, and such consent should never be encouraged."

The husband and wife are not allowed to give any evidence, that may directly criminate (4), or even tend to criminate each other (5). Thus, where an actual marriage has been proved between two persons, a woman cannot be suffered to prove an antecedent marriage between herself and one of the parties (6), the consequence of which might be a prosecution for bigamy : and it has been laid down by one learned judge, that if a witness has been examined to a material fact in a cause, which from its nature must have been known to him, (as, for example, to his own marriage,) his wife cannot be called by the same party to contradict him (6), as such evidence might lead to a charge of perjury, and cause the husband to be apprehended.

(1) R. v. Locker and others, 5 Esp. C. 107; and see R. v. Frederick and another, 2 Str. 1094. S. P.

(2) Monroe v. Twisleton, cited in Aveson v. Lord Kinnaird, 6 East 192.

(3) Barker v. Sir Woolston Dixie, Rep. Temp. Hard. 264.

(4) Mary Grigg's case, Sir T. Raym. 1.

(5) 1 H. P. C. 301. Broughton v. Harpur cor. Holt, C. J. 2 Lord Raym. 752. R. v. Cliviger, 2 T. R. 263.

(6) R. v. Cliviger, 2 T. R. 263,

(*a*) The wife is competent to prove any fact arising after the divorce. *Monroe* v. *Twisleton*, *Peake's Ev. App.* lxxxvii.

*The case of the king against the inhabitants of Cliviger, which supports the two last positions, was shortly this. On an appeal against an order of removal of a pauper and also of a woman as his wife, the respondents having proved the marriage, the appellants called the man for the purpose of proving a former marriage with another woman, but he swore directly the reverse; they then called that woman, to prove the alleged former marriage. The Court of Quarter Sessions rejected the witness; and the Court of King's Bench determined that she was not competent, for the reasons which have been mentioned. This case does not go so far as to decide, that where a witness proves a fact on one side, the *adverse* party shall be precluded from calling the husband or wife of the witness to disprove that fact. And as the most serious inconveniences might result from the adoption of such an exclusive rule, which would be a bar to the full and complete investigation of the subject, (even in cases, too, where the property, the character, or even the life of the party may be at stake,) it may perhaps be safely laid down, that such contradictory evidence would be admitted. And many cases might be supposed, in which it would be extremely desirable, and perhaps necessary to public justice, that the *same* party, who calls the husband as witness, should afterwards be allowed to prove by the evidence of his wife, that the fact is different from what he has stated; for although they may directly contradict each other as to a particular fact, it will not follow that either party has been guilty of perjury.

There are several exceptions, to which the reason of the general rule on this subject does not apply, or where it is outweighed by considerations of higher importance.

Exceptions.

First, if a woman is taken away by force and married, she may be witness against her husband indicted on st. 3 H. 7. c. 2., for she is not a wife *de jure*, a contract

by Ashurst, J. Mr. Justice Grose (the only other judge in Court) did not mention this as the ground of his judgment, nor did he notice that part of the case.

obtained by force having no obligation in law (1). From
* 68 *this it should seem, that if the actual marriage is valid, (as where the woman after the abduction consents to the marriage voluntarily, and not induced by any precedent menace,) her evidence ought not to be allowed (1) (*a*).

Secondly, on an indictment for a second marriage during the continuance of a former marriage, though the first wife cannot be a witness (2), yet the second wife may after proof of the first marriage (3).

Thirdly, a wife may be a witness on the prosecution of her husband for an offence committed against her person (4). This was determined by all the judges present on Lord Audley's trial: and has been since confirmed by the greatest authorities (5), on every principle of humanity and justice. So in Azyre's case, on an indictment for beating his wife, Lord Raymond suffered her to give evidence (6). A wife is permitted to exhibit articles of the peace against her husband (7); and the Court will not receive affidavits on the part of the defendant, to contradict the truth of the articles exhibited against him, and prevent his giving surety (8). So, an affidavit of a married woman has been admitted to be read, on an application to the Court of King's Bench for an information against her husband, for an attempt to take her away by force after arti-

(1) Swendsen's case, 5 St. Tr. 456. Bull. N. P. 286. Ramsay's case, cited Rep. Temp. Hard. 83. 1 Hale P. C. 302. 661.

(1) Acc. 1 Hale P. C. 302. 4 Bl. Com. 209, contra.

(2) Mary Grigg's case, Sir T. Raym. 1. Hawk. b. 2. c. 46. s. 71.

(3) 1 Hale P. C. 393. Bull. N. P. 287. 1 East P. C. 469.

(4) 1 St. Tr. 393. Hutton 116.

(5) 1 Hale P. C. 301. Hawk. b. 2. c. 46. s. 77. Probyn, J. in Rep. Temp. Hard. 83. Bull. N. P. 287. 1 Bl. Comm. 443. Doubted in Grigg's case, Sir T. Raym. 1, and in Gilb. Ev. 120.

(6) 1 Str. 633; Bull. N. P. 287. S. C. Jagger's case, 1 East P. C. 454.

(7) Bull. N. P. ib.

(8) Lord Vane's case, 2 Str. 1202. more fully stated from Mr. Ford's MS. in 13 East 171. n. (a); R. v. Doherty, Ib. S. P.

(*a*) In the case of Perry, on an indictment for a forcible marriage, the wife was admitted a witness for her husband, to prove that the elopement and marriage were voluntary and not forced. *Bristol Assizes*, 1794, 1 *M'Nally* 181.

cles of separation (9): and it would be strange, says Mr. Justice Buller, to permit her to be a witness to ground a prosecution, and not afterwards to be a witness at the trial (10). On the trial of a man for the murder of his wife, her dying declarations are evidence against him (11). It has been said indeed, that a wife may *be witness against her husband in case of high treason (1) (*a*); but there are authorities the other way (2). * 69

Fourthly, where the wife has made contracts with the authority and consent of the husband, she has been considered his agent for that purpose, and her representations are evidence against the husband, who has permitted her to contract for him with third persons, on the same footing as the representations of any other agent (3) (*b*). Thus, in an action of assumpsit by a servant for wages, the plaintiff was allowed to give in evidence a deed executed by the wife of the defendant at the time of the hiring, which, though void as a deed, was admitted in order to show the terms of the contract (4).*

Fifthly, Commissioners of bankrupt could not at com-

(9) Lady Lawley's case, Bull. N. P. 287. Mary Mead's case, 1 Burr. 543.

(10) Bull. N. P. 287.

(11) Woodcock's case, 2 Leach Cr. C. 563. John's case, 1 East P.C. 357.

(1) Dictum, in Grigg's case. Sir T. Raym. 1. cited in Gilb. Ev. 119. and Bull. N. P. 289.

(2) Brownlow 47.

(3) Emerson v. Blonden, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 142. Palethrop v. Furnish, 2 Esp. N. P. C. 511. n. Gregory v. Parker, 1 Camp. N. P. C. 394. See 15 Ves. 159.

(4) White v. Cuyler, 6 T. R. 176.

* In an anonymous case reported in 1 Strange 527, where an action was brought for nursing the defendant's child, Pratt, C. J. admitted evidence on the part of the plaintiff, that the defendant's wife had represented her agreement with him to be for so much per week; because such matters, he said, are usually entrusted to the women. Bull. N. P. 287. S. C. But it has been since determined, that the declarations of the wife are not admissible against the husband, in an action brought by him in right of his wife. Alban and Wife v. Prichett, 6 T. R. 680.

(*a*) M'Nally says, that in the researches which he had made, he had not discovered any trial for treason where the wife was examined as a witness against her husband. 1 *M'Nally* 181.

(*b*) 10 *Johns. Rep.* 38. *Hughes's Administrators* v. *Stokes's Administrators*, 1 *Hayw.* 372.

mon law examine the bankrupt's wife (5). But now by st. 21 J. 1. c. 19. s. 5 & 6., which recites, that doubts had arisen upon the point, it is provided, "that, after the party is declared a bankrupt, the commissioners may examine his wife on oath, for the finding out of the estate, goods, and chattels of such bankrupt, concealed, kept, or disposed of by such wife, in her own person, or by her act or means, or by any other person."

Sixthly, upon an appeal against an order of bastardy in the case of a married woman, Lord Hardwicke and the
* 70 *other Judges held, that she was a competent witness to prove her criminal connexion with the appellant, though her husband was interested both in the question and in the event of the cause, because such a fact so secret in its nature can scarce ever be proved by other evidence (1). But this is only from the necessity of the thing: she is not competent to prove any other fact, as want of access (2), which other witnesses may be reasonably supposed capable of proving. To admit such evidence would be giving the wife a power to bastardize her child, and to discharge the husband from the burden of its maintenance (*a*).

On an appeal against the removal of a woman as the widow of A. B. deceased, prima facie evidence of the marriage having been produced on the part of the respondents, the Court of King's Bench determined, that the woman was a competent witness, on the part of the appellants, to *disprove* the marriage (3).

(5) Anon. 1 Brownlow 47.

(1) R. v. Reading, Rep. Temp. Hard, 82. R. v. Bedell, Andr. 8 R. v. Luffe, 8 East 203. Gilb. Ev. 139.

(2) Ante (1), R. v. Rooke, 1 Wils. 340. R. v. Kea, 11 East 132.

(3) R. v. Bramley, 6 T. R. 330; R. v. St. Peter's, Burr. Set. Cas. 25. S. P.

(*a*) These principles were fully recognized in a late case in Pennsylvania. The defendant was indicted for fornication with one Sarah Myers, a married woman, and begetting a bastard child on her body, and it was held that Sarah Myers was a competent witness, from the necessity of the case, upon common law principles, to prove the criminal connexion, but nothing further; and therefore that she could not be questioned as to the non access of her husband. *Commonwealth* v. *Shepherd*, 6 *Binney* 283.

In the case of Campbell v. Twemlow (4), which lately came before the Court of Exchequer on a motion to set aside an award, one of the grounds of the application was, that the arbitrator had rejected the evidence of a woman called on the part of the plaintiff, who had cohabited with him for several years and passed as his wife, but who would have stated, that she had never been married to him. The point was much argued at the bar. The Court, considering it a doubtful question, (as the report states,) declined giving any opinion, as it was unnecessary for the determination of the case; and they refused the motion, on the ground, that the opinion of the arbitrator was final and conclusive, all matters both of law and fact having been left to his decision. Mr. Baron Richards cited a case, before Lord Kenyon, on the Chester circuit, in the year 1782, where, on a trial for *forgery, the prisoner called a woman as his witness, whom he had himself in Court represented to be his wife, but afterwards, on hearing an objection taken to her competency, denied that she was married to him, and Lord Kenyon refused to admit her evidence. *71

Seventhly, it has been ruled at nisi prius, that a wife may be witness, in an action between third persons not immediately affecting the interest of the husband, though her evidence may possibly expose him to a legal demand; as, in an action between third persons for goods sold and delivered, to prove the goods sold not on the credit of the defendant, but on her husband's credit (1). This evidence, it may be said, was in some measure against the husband, though he was not a party in the suit. On the other hand, to reject her evidence in such a case would be a hardship on the defendant, who may have no other means of defending himself against an unjust demand: and though upon her testimony the defendant may have a verdict, and an action may afterwards, in consequence be brought

(4) 1 Price 81.
(1) Williams v. Johnson, by King, C. J., 1 Str. 504. Bull. N. P. 287. S. C.

against the husband, she would not then be admitted as a witness, nor could her evidence in the first suit be produced against him (*a*).

Sect. IV.

Of the Effect of Admissions by a Party to the Suit, or by his Agent, against the Party's Interest.

As the parties to a suit are excluded from being witnesses on account of their interest, statements or representations made by them against their interest must be

(*a*) B. lent certain goods to the wife of C., of which C. being in the possession, conveyed them by bill of sale to R., but they continued in the possession of C. until B. having understood that R. intended to take them away, took them into his own possession, whereupon R. brought an action of trover against B., in which C.'s wife was offered as a witness on the part of B. the defendant; and it was held that she was competent to prove the loan from B., and notice to R. of B.'s property; on the ground that the interest of her husband was equally balanced between the parties; and that in civil actions in which the husband is no party, the wife may be called on as a witness, even to facts, which if proved in another action to which her husband is a party, and by evidence other than her own may go to charge him. *Baring* v. *Reeder*, 1 *Hen. and Mun.* 154.

Another exception to the general rule by which husband and wife are excluded from testifying for or against each other, was made in the following case;—Articles of agreement were entered into between the husband, wife, and C., the trustee of the wife, by which the husband permitted the wife to live separate from him; and the trustee, C., covenanted, on the part of the wife, to pay the husband three thousand eight hundred dollars, on his delivering to the wife for her separate use, the coachee and horses which he had lately purchased: the husband brought an action of covenant against C. to recover the three thousand eight hundred dollars, and the declarations of the wife were offered in evidence by the plain-

evidence against them, and in many cases they will be the strongest evidence. Upon this principle the free admissions of one of the parties to a suit on the matter in issue, and the voluntary confession of a prisoner under a criminal charge, are always received in evidence against the party (*b*).

*First, with respect to admissions: * 72

The admissions of a party to the suit against his interest are evidence in favour of the other side, whether made by the real party on record, or by a nominal party who sues as a trustee for the benefit of another (1), or whether by the party who is really interested in the suit though not named on the record (2). Thus, in an action

Stark. Evi. part IV. 40

(1) Bauerman v. Radenius, 7. T. R. 664.

(2) R. v. Hardwick, 11 East 578. 589.

---

tiff, to show the delivery of the coachee and horses, and were admitted by the judge: on a bill of exceptions being brought, the court decided that the evidence was admissible. Both parties, the court say, by the covenant, concurred in her capacity to receive these articles, and she became, for that purpose, their mutual agent. Her declaration, or confession, that the act was done, became legal evidence of that fact, as a necessary consequence of her authority, under the articles to receive the coachee and horses; for no principle would seem to be more clear than that the person to whom performance of an act is agreed to be made, is competent to acknowledge such performance. If she was competent to receive, she was competent to give a receipt for them, and if her receipt would have been good evidence of the delivery, her parol admission must be equally so. And again; if her act or admission be good in one case, to charge the husband in favour of a third person, because she was his agent, the rule ought equally to apply in favour of the husband, when he and a third person by the contract between them, have mutually referred to an act in which she was to be a party. *Fenner* v. *Lewis*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 38.

(*b*) It has been held that an admission in an answer in Chancery was evidence against the defendant, in an action brought by another plaintiff. Post 267. *n.* So, an admission in a case made for argument, is evidence against the party making it. *Vandervoort & another* v. *Smith*, 2 *Caines' Rep.* 155.

of debt upon a bond conditioned to pay money to L. D., for whose benefit the action was brought, the defendant proved, that L. D. had said in a conversation about this bond, that the defendant owed nothing, upon which the jury found for the defendant: on a motion for a new trial, it was argued that the declarations of L. D., who was no party to the action, ought not to affect the plaintiff, and affidavits were offered to explain L. D.'s evidence; but the court said, that the affidavits were inadmissible, and that it was to be considered as if L. D. was the plaintiff, the action being for L. D.'s benefit (3). And in an appeal against the removal of a pauper, declarations by a rated inhabitant of either parish, concerning the facts in issue, are admissible in evidence, not only against himself, but also against the other rated inhabitants of his parish (4): for they are the parties really interested, although the appeal may be entered in the names of the parish officers; and they are not compellable as parties to give evidence of the fact (5).

Ante 60

It may be inferred from a former part of this section, that in a civil suit against several persons, who are proved to have a joint interest in the decision, a declaration made by one of those persons, concerning a material fact within his knowledge, is evidence against him, and against all who are parties with him to the suit (6). In an action of covenant, therefore, against two defendants, the affidavit of one of *them may be given in evidence against both (1) (*a*). So, in an action by several partners against the defendant for the non-performance of an agreement, a declaration

* 73

(3) Hanson v. Parker, 1 Wils. 257. Smith v. Lyon, 3 Campb. N. P. C. 465.
(4) R. v. Hardwick, 11 East 578.
(5) 11 East 589. R. v. Woburn, 10 East 395.
(6) 11 East 589.
(1) Vicary's case, Gilb. Ev. 51.

(*a*) In an action on a joint note, executed by A. & B. as his security, brought against B. only, after the bankruptcy of A. under the laws of the United States, it was held that the admissions of A. after his discharge, were evidence against B. *Howard* v. *Cobb*, 3 *Day* 309.

by one of the partners, that the goods, to which the agreement related, were his separate property, is evidence against all the plaintiffs suing as upon a joint contract (2). The rule has even been extended in actions so far, as to admit the declarations of one partner to be evidence against another, concerning joint contracts and their joint interest, although the person, who makes such declarations, is not a party to the suit: as where, in an action by a creditor against some of the partnership firm, the answer of another partner to a bill filed by other creditors was received in evidence against the defendants, not indeed to prove the partnership, but that being established, as an admission against those (*b*), who are as one person with him in interest (3). And the admission of a partner, though not a party to the suit, is evidence as to joint contracts against any other partner, as well after the determination of the partnership as during its continuance (4) (*c*).

This is the rule respecting admissions in the case of joint contracts, or where several persons have one and the same interest in the subject matter. But the same rule cannot be applied to actions of trespass or to criminal proceedings. In an action of trespass against several de-

(2) Lucas and others v. De la Cour, 1 Maule & Sel. 249.

(3) Grant v. Jackson, Peake, N. P. C. 203. Wood and others v. Braddick, 1 Taunt. 104. And see Whitcomb v. Whiting, 2 Doug. 652. Jackson v. Fairbank, 2 H. Bl. 340. Thwaites v. Richardson, Peake, N. P. C. 16.

(4) Wood and others v. Braddick, 1 Taunt. 104.

(*b*) Vide *Kirby*, 62. 174. 203. where it was held that the admissions of a party in interest, if not joined in the suit, could not be given in evidence.

(*c*) But in *Hackley* v. *Patrick*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 536. it was decided, that an acknowledgment of an account by one partner after a dissolution of the partnership, would not bind the other partners. Such an acknowledgment, however, would be sufficient to prevent the operation of the statute of limitations. *Smith* v. *Ludlow*, 6 *Johns. Rep.* 267. The admission of one of the defendants is not evidence to charge another defendant with the fact of being a partner with him. *Whitney* v. *Ferris*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 66.

fendants, an admission by one of the defendants is not evidence against the others to prove the fact of their being co-trespassers, and, even where that fact is fully established, it seems very doubtful, whether any admissions or declarations made by one of the defendants, as to the joint motives or designs of the party, can be received as evidence against the others, except so far as they accompany
* 74 the act, and may be considered *as forming a part of the res gesta. Where several persons are proved to have combined together for the same illegal purpose, any act done by one of the party, in pursuance of the original concerted plan, and with reference to the common object, is in the contemplation of the law the act of the whole party (1), and, therefore, the proof of such act by eye-witnesses would be evidence against any of the others, who were engaged in the same conspiracy; and further, any declarations made by one of the party at the time of doing such illegal act seem not only to be evidence against himself, as tending to determine the quality of the act, but to be evidence also against the rest of the party, who are as much responsible as if they had themselves done the act. But what one of the party may have been heard to say at some other time, as to the share which some of the others had in the execution of the common design, or as to the object of the conspiracy, cannot, it is conceived, be admitted as evidence to affect them on their trial for the same offence. It has been solemnly decided, as will be shown in treating of the admissibility of confessions, that a confession is evidence only against the person himself who confesses, not against other persons, although they may have been proved to be his accomplices (*a*).

(1) R. v. Stone, 6 Tr. R. 527.

(*a*) In an action against several defendants for a combination to defraud the plaintiff, in which one of them suffered a default, and the others pleaded to the action, the confessions of the former were admitted in evidence, to enhance the damages against all the defendants. *Bostwick* v. *Lewis*, 1 *Day* 33.

The statement or representation of an agent in making an agreement, or in doing an act within the scope of his authority, is evidence against the principal himself, and equivalent to his own acknowledgment (2): for what the

The statement of an agent.

(2) See the judgment by the Master of the Rolls in Fairlie v. Hastings, 10 Ves. 127.

In actions for a criminal conversation with the wife of the plaintiff, and in prosecutions for polygamy, the marriage of the plaintiff, in the one instance, and the first marriage of the defendant in the other, cannot be proved by his confession. *Morris* v. *Miller*, 4 *Burr.* 2057. *The People* v. *Humphreys*, 7 *Johns. Rep.* 314.

The acknowledgment of a party is not always conclusive evidence against him, post 80.; as, where, in an action on a promissory note, evidence was given that the defendant had acknowledged his signature to it, he was, notwithstanding, admitted to give evidence to show that the signature was not genuine. *Hall and another* v. *Huse*, 10 *Mass. Rep.* 39. nor does an acknowledgment or admission in writing, always conclude the party making it: thus, where a bill of lading states goods to have been shipped in good order, the master who signed it is not excluded from showing that they were damaged at the time of delivery; for, a bill of lading, although prima facie evidence of the highest nature, is not conclusive. *Barrett and another* v. *Rogers*, 7 *Mass. Rep.* 297. So, a receipt, although absolute in its terms, and expressed to be in full, is not conclusive, and parol evidence is admissible to explain or contradict it. *Stratton* v. *Rastall*, 2 *Term Rep.* 366. 5 *Vez.* 87. 12 *Johns. Rep.* 531. *Ensign* v. *Webster*, 1 *Johns. Cas.* 145. *House* v. *Low*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 378. *M'Kinstry* v. *Pearsall*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 319. *Tobey* v. *Barber*, 5 *Johns. Rep.* 68. *Putnam* v. *Lewis*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 389. *Johnson* v. *Weed*, 9 *Johns. Rep.* 310. If two trustees execute a conveyance of land, in which is contained an acknowledgment of the receipt of the consideration money, it is competent for one of the trustees to show that the whole of the money went into the hands of the other, and thus exonerate himself from liability. *Kip* v. *Denniston*, 4 *Johns. Rep.* 23. and the cases there cited. 2 *Madd. Chan.* 118, 119.

The confessions of individual members of a corporation aggregate, a party to the suit, which were not made in the exercise of any corporate duty, cannot be received in evidence. *President &c. of Hartford Bank* v. *Hart*, 3 *Day* 493.

agent says may be explanatory of the agreement, or determine the quality of the act which it accompanies, and must, therefore, be as binding on the principal as the act or agreement itself. To prove such a representation, the opposite party is not obliged to call the agent, but may establish it by other evidence. Thus, what an agent says at the time of a sale, which he is employed to make, is evidence as part of the transaction of selling. But the
* 75 principal is not *bound by a representation of the agent at another time (1). So it should seem, if a person buys goods, and directs the vendor to deliver them to an agent employed by him to receive them, the purchaser would be bound by the receipt of his agent given at the time of delivery; but not by any subsequent acknowledgment. In the case of Biggs v. Laurence (2), which was an action for goods sold and delivered, Mr. Justice Buller admitted a written paper, by which the defendant's agent acknowledged the receipt of the goods, as evidence against the principal; and on that evidence the plaintiff recovered (*a*). However, it was on one occasion (3) stated by counsel in argument, that Lord Kenyon since that case had frequently ruled the contrary, without its ever having been questioned: and this statement seems to have been acquiesced in by Lord Kenyon (4), who said, "that was not the point, upon which the case was afterwards argued or determined, on the motion for a new trial," meaning the point, that such a receipt could be admitted in evidence. It does not appear, from the case of Biggs v. Laurence, whether the agent's acknowledgment, of having received the goods, was made at the time of delivery, or on what other occasion: though, upon this fact, according to the cases above cited, particularly the case of Fairlie v. Hastings, in which

(1) Helyar v. Hawke, 5 Esp. N. P. C. 74. Peto v. Hague, 5 Esp. N. P. C. 135. Alexander v. Gibson, 2 Camp. 555. Palethorp v. Furnish, 2 Esp. N. P. C. 511. n.

(2) 3 T. R. 454.

(3) Beaurman v. Radenius, 7 T. R. 665.

(4) See 10 Ves. 128.

(*a*) Vide ante, 71. *n*.

the subject was fully discussed by the Master of the Rolls, the admissibility of such evidence may be found materially to depend. In one case indeed (5), Lord Kenyon, C. J. is said to have refused to admit an agent's letter as evidence of an agreement against the principal, holding, that the agent himself ought to be examined. "If the agreement," (said the Master of the Rolls (6), adverting to this case,) "was contained in the letter, I should have thought it sufficient to prove that the letter was written by the agent: but, if the letter was offered as *proof of the contents of a *pre-existing* agreement, then it was properly rejected." And the Court of Common Pleas lately decided, after much argument, in the cases of Kahl v. Jansen (1), and Langhorn v. Allnutt (2), that the letters of an agent abroad to his principal, containing a narrative of the transaction in which he had been employed, were not admissible in evidence against the principal, as the mere representation of the agent. The general rule on the subject was there fully recognized and confirmed. "When it is proved, said the Chief Justice, that A. is agent of B., whatever A. does, or says, or writes, *in the making of a contract* as agent of B., is admissible in evidence, because it is *part of the contract*, which he makes for B., and which, therefore, binds him, but it is not admissible *as the agent's account* of what passes (3)." Such declarations are admitted in evidence, not for the purpose of establishing the truth of the fact stated, but as representations by which the principal is as much bound as if he made them himself, and which are equally binding, whether the fact stated be true or false (*a*).

* 76

(5) Maesters v. Abraham, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 375.
(6) 10 Ves. 127.
(1) 4 Taunt. 565.
(2) 4 Taunt. 511. and Reyner v. Pearson, 4 Taunt. 663. S. P.
(3) 4 Taunt. 519.

(*a*) The contemporaneous correspondence of an agent, in that character, on the subject in which he was employed with his principal, is proper evidence to show the original nature and complexion of the facts in controversy, and is evidence for the agent in

From analogy to the preceding case of agent and principal, what a sheriff's officer has said at the time of the execution of a writ, or concerning his custody of a debtor taken in execution, will be admissible in evidence against the sheriff himself in an action against him for an escape, as *part of the transaction* in which he represents the defendant, and for which the defendant is responsible (4). The declaration of an under sheriff is not evidence against his principal, excepting so far as it constitutes a *part of the res gesta;* and though the rule seems to have been laid down in larger and more general terms, in the case of Yabsley and Doble, it has been so restricted by several later authorities (*b*).

*77 *On the same principle, if one party refers another, for information on a disputed fact, to a third person as

(4) Bowsher v. Cally, Sher. of Wilts. 1 Campb. N. P. C. 391. n. North v. Miles, Sher. of Mid. do. 389. Yabsley v. Doble, 1 Ld. Ray. 190. Kempland v. Macaulay, Peake, N. P. C. 65.

---

a suit in which he is a party. *Bingham* v. *Cabot et al.* 3 *Dall.* 39. Where a letter written by an agent was given in evidence, as proof of a contract, it was held, that the principal having confided to his agent the making of the contract, confided to him, of consequence, the power of furnishing evidence of the contract: the contract having been made by parol without witnesses, it was impossible to prove it in any other manner than by subsequent declarations of the party, but, although these declarations were evidence, they were not conclusive. *Meade* v. *M'Dowell*, 5 *Binney* 195.

(*b*) In an action on the case against a sheriff for a false return to a *fi. fa.* it was held that the acknowledgment of the deputy of the sheriff made to the attorney of the plaintiff, in answer to inquiries relative to the execution, which had been delivered to the deputy to be executed, and while the execution was in force, was admissible evidence to charge the sheriff; as the declarations were made to a party concerned, in relation to the business of the execution, and while the obligation to execute it remained in full force; they were, therefore, made in the course of the transaction, and were to be considered as part of the act of the deputy touching the execution of the writ. *Mott and others* v. *Kip*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 478. Vide *Hecker* v. *Jarret*, 3 *Binney* 404.

authorized to answer for him (1), or employs an agent to make certain propositions respecting a transaction between himself and another (2), he is bound by what his agent says, or does, within the scope of his authority, as much as if it had been done, or said, by himself. Thus, for example, in an action for goods sold and delivered, where it appeared at the trial, that, in a conversation between the plaintiff and defendant, the former asserted that he had delivered the goods by one C., and the defendant replied, "If C. will say he did deliver the goods, I will pay for them," the plaintiff was allowed to give in evidence C.'s answer respecting the matter referred to him (3). In the case of Fabrigas v. Mostyn, a point arose, which may serve as another example to illustrate the rule here laid down. A witness, who had been employed by the defendant, to convey certain proposals to the plaintiff, explained them to him by an interpreter, from whom also he received the answer (4): the question was, whether the words of the interpreter could be given in evidence by the witness, as the answer of the plaintiff; or whether the interpreter himself ought to be called, as the witness understood neither the questions put to the plaintiff, nor the answer made by him. But Mr. Justice Gould ruled, that the evidence of the witness was clearly admissible, and sufficient. Here the interpreter was the accredited agent of the parties, acting within the scope of his authority, and in the execution of his agency.

It must be remembered, that the cases, in which the declarations of an agent have been admitted against the principal, are exceptions to that general rule, which requires evidence to be given upon oath: and the exception is confined *to such statements as are made by him, either at the time of his making an agreement about which he is em- * 78

(1) Daniell v. Pitt, 1 Campb. N. P. C. 366.

(2) Gainsford v. Grammar, 2 Campb. N. P. C. 9.

(3) Daniell v. Pitt, 1 Campb. N.P. C. 366; 6 Esp. N. P. C. 74, S. C. Williams v. Innes, 1 Campb. N. P. C. 364. Brock v. Kent, do. n. 366. Burt v. Palmer, 5 Esp. N. P. C. 145.

(4) 11 St. Tr. 171.

ployed, or in acting within the scope of his authority. "Except in one or other of these ways, (said the Master of the Rolls, in Fairlie v. Hastings (1),) I do not see how they can be evidence against the principal:" and, therefore, in that case, (where the fact, sought to be established, was, that a bond had been executed by the defendant to the plaintiff, which the defendant had got possession of,) he refused to admit, as evidence of this fact, the declarations of the defendant's agent, who had been employed to keep the bond for the plaintiff's benefit, and who, on its being demanded by the plaintiff, informed him that it had been delivered to the defendant (2). "The admission of an agent, (continued the Master of the Rolls,) cannot be assimilated to the admission of the principal. A party is bound by his own admission, and is not permitted to contradict it. But it is impossible to say, a man is precluded from questioning or contradicting any thing, that any person may have asserted, as to his conduct or agreement, merely because that person has been an agent (*a*). If any fact, material to the interest of either party, rests in the knowledge of an agent, the general rule is, that it ought to be proved by his testimony, not by his mere assertion."

The force and effect of an admission must of course depend upon the circumstances under which it has been made. In many cases, it will be evidence of the strongest kind, if clearly proved: in some, it amounts to little. A full and free admission of a debt is, unless satisfactorily explained, conclusive against the party who makes it. On the other hand, an offer to pay money by way of compromise, and to get rid of an action, is not evidence of a debt (3); in such cases, the point to be considered is, what the view and intention of the party was in making the offer, whether to buy peace, or from a conviction of the

(1) 10 Ves. 128.
(2) Fairlie v. Hastings, 10 Ves. 128; Young v. Wright, 1 Campb. 139; Wilson v. Turner, 1 Taunt. 398.
(3) Bull. N. P. [236.]

(*a*) Vide ante 76. n. (*a*)

justice of *the demand against him. "Thus, if A. sue B. for 100l., and B. offer to pay him 20l., it shall not be received in evidence, for this neither admits nor ascertains any debt, and is no more than saying he would give 20l. to get rid of the action. But if an account consists of ten articles, and B. admits that a particular one is due, it is good evidence for so much (1)." Admissions of particular articles before an arbitrator are also evidence under the same limitation, that is, when they are made, not with a view to a compromise, but while the parties are contesting their rights (2).

Admissions by a party to the suit are evidence, whether made before or after the commencement of the action (*a*), whether before arrest or after, whether in writing or by parol. The recital of a fact in the counterpart of an indenture is evidence against the party by whom the deed is executed (3). So, answers in chancery are evidence in trials at law against the party that made them (4), and very strong evidence, as they are delivered in upon oath.

It is scarcely necessary to observe, that the whole of the answer or admission must be taken together, in order to show distinctly the full meaning and sense of the party (*b*). Thus, if a person, in making an admission against his own interest, refers to a written paper, without which the admission is not complete, the contents of the paper ought to be shown, before the statement can be used as evidence

(1) Bull. N. P. [236.]
(2) Bull. N. P. Ib. 1 P. Wms. 497. Slack v. Buchanan, Peake, N. P. C. 5. Waldridge v. Kennison, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 143.
(3) Burleigh v. Stibbs, 5 T. R. 465. See *infra*, as to recitals.
(4) Bull. N. P. 237.

(*a*) Vide *Morris's Lessee* v. *Van Deren*, 1 *Dall.* 65. *Sluby* v. *Champlin*, 4 *Johns. Rep.* 461.

(*b*) Vide *Carver* v. *Tracy*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 427. *Fenner* v. *Lewis*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 38. *Credit* v. *Brown*, *Ibid.* 365. *Hopkins* v. *Smith*, 11 *Johns. Rep.* 161. *Waggoner* v. *Gray's Administrators*, 2 *Hen. &. Mun.* 603. *Newman* v. *Bradley*, 1 *Dall.* 240. *Farrell* v. *M'Clea*, *Id.* 392.

against the party (5). Or, if a person says, "that he did owe a debt, but that he had paid it," such an admission will not be received as evidence to prove the debt, without being also evidence of the payment (6). What he has said in his own favour may perhaps weigh very little with
* 80 *the jury, while his admission against himself may be conclusive; however, it is reasonable, that if any part of his statement is admitted in evidence, the whole should be admitted (1).

An admission by the defendant, that he owes a certain sum of money to the plaintiff, is strong evidence against him in an action to recover the debt, but it will not be *conclusive;* the defendant, if he can, may prove the fact of payment, or show a receipt, or give other evidence to repel the presumption arising from his acknowledgment. A bill delivered by an attorney to his client, for business done during a certain period, is strong presumptive evidence against any additional item within the same period; but the bill is not like a deed to operate as an estoppel, and the party will be at liberty to prove the fact of his having transacted other business for the defendant (2). A notice to quit at a certain time is prima facie evidence, that the tenancy commenced at that period, if the notice was served personally on the tenant, and if he made no objection to the time of quitting mentioned in the notice (3). The circumstance of his not making such an objection has been considered as prima facie evidence of an admission and acquiescence. If, on the other hand, it should be made to appear, that at the time of the service the tenant did not look at the notice so as to know its contents, such evidence would completely repel the supposition of any acquiescence on the part of the tenant; for he cannot be supposed to ad-

(5) See Jacob v. Lindsay, 1 East 462. Smith v. Young, 1 Campb. N. P. C. 439. Ld. Barrymore v. Taylor, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 325. Randle v. Blackburn, 5 Taunt. 245.

(6) Anonym. case, cited 12 Vin. Abr. (A. b. 23.)

(1) See also Green v. Dunn, 3 Camp. N. P. C. 215. Smith v. Young, 1 Campb. N. P. C. 439.

(2) Loveridge v. Botham, 1 Bos. & Pul. 49.

(3) Doe d. Clarges v. Forster, 13 East 405.

mit a fact, of which he does not appear to have been informed.

*Sect. V. * 81

Of the Admissibility of the Confession of a Prisoner against himself.

Since an admission is evidence against a party in civil suits, with much stronger reason is the voluntary confession of a prisoner evidence against him on a criminal prosecution; for it is not to be conceived, that a man would be induced to make a free confession of guilt, so contrary to the feelings and principles of human nature, if the facts confessed were not true. The general rule on this subject was very fully considered in a judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Grose, on a case reserved for the opinion of the twelve judges (1); and it seems to be now clearly established, that a free and voluntary confession by a person accused of an offence, whether made before his apprehension or after, whether on a judicial examination or after commitment, whether reduced into writing or not, in short, that any voluntary confession, made by a prisoner to any person at any time or place, is strong evidence against him; and, if satisfactorily proved, sufficient to convict without any corroborating circumstance (2). But the confession must be voluntary, not obtained by improper influence, nor drawn from the prisoner by means of a threat or promise: for, however slight the promise or threat may have been, a confession so obtained cannot be received in evidence (3), on account of the uncertainty and doubt,

(1) Lambe's case, 2 Leach Cr. C. 625. Hawk. P. C. b. 2. c. 46. s. 31. Thomas's case, 2 Leach 723.

(2) Wheeling's case, cor. Ld. Kenyon, C. J. 1 Leach Cr. C. 349. n. (*a*).

(3) Thompson's case, 1 Leach Cr. C. 327. Cass's case, n. (*a*). ib. 328. Warwickshall's case, 1 Leach Cr. C. 299.

whether it was not made rather from a motive of fear or of interest than from a sense of guilt (*b*).

In Lambe's case (4), before mentioned, the question for the opinion of the judges was, whether a written examina-
* 82 *tion, taken by a committing magistrate and containing a confession, which the prisoner on hearing it read over to him admitted to be true but refused to sign, ought to have been received in evidence, as it was not signed either by the magistrate or by the prisoner; and a majority of the

(4) 2 Leach Cr. C. 265. Thomas's case, ib. 727, S. P.

(*b*) Vide *Bell's case*, 1 *M'Nally* 43. A confession extorted by personal suffering is inadmissible. *State* v. *Jenkins*, 2 *Tyler* 377. Vide *Commonwealth* v. *Battis*, 1 *Mass. Rep.* 95. *Commonwealth* v. *Chubbock*, *Id.* 144. Where a boy of about 12 years old, who had been indicted for arson, was urged to make a confession, by holding out the expectation of pardon, if he did, and by threats of a rigorous confinement if he did not, but without effect; and who afterwards on an examination before a magistrate voluntarily confessed the crime; the court seems to have been of opinion that the confession was admissible, leaving it to the jury to consider whether the prisoner had falsely declared himself guilty or not. *The Commonwealth* v. *Dillon*, 4 *Dall.* 116. The following observations are made by the court in a case in North Carolina: Where A. makes a confession and relates circumstances which are proven actually to have existed as related in the confession, that may be evidence sufficient for a jury to proceed upon to convict the prisoner, but a naked confession unattended with circumstances, is not sufficient. A confession from the nature of the thing, is a very doubtful species of evidence and to be received with great caution. It is hardly to be supposed that a man perfectly possessed of himself, would make a confession to take away his own life. It must generally proceed from a promise or hope of favour, or from a dread of punishment, and in such situations the mind is agitated—the man may be easily tempted to go further than the truth. Besides, the witness respecting the confession, may have mistaken his meaning. How easy it is to understand the speaker different from what he meant? The smallest mistake in this particular might prove fatal. *State* v. *Long*, 1 *Hayw.* 455.

judges held, that such a confession would have been evidence at common law, and that it is not rendered inadmissible by any provision in the statutes of Philip and Mary respecting examinations and informations before justices of the peace (*a*). If a prisoner's confession, even when not reduced into writing, be evidence against him, *a fortiori*, it must be admissible, when taken down in writing; for, the fact confessed, being thus rendered less doubtful, is of course entitled to greater credit; and it would be absurd to say, that an instrument is invalidated by a circumstance which gives it additional strength and authenticity (1).

The informations against the prisoner are to be taken on oath; the examination of the prisoner ought to be without oath (2). And whenever a confession is given in evidence, the whole of what has been confessed must be taken together (3): but if only the material parts of the confession are taken down in writing, and they are afterwards read over in the presence of the prisoner, and admitted by him to be true, that admission will make them evidence (4). The

(1) See Mr. Justice Grose's judgment in Lambe's case, 2 Leach Cr. C. 629.

(2) Bull. N. P. 242. Hawk. P. C. b. 2. c. 46. s. 37. Kelyng 2.

(3) Hawk. ib. s. 42. R. v. Paine, 5 Mod. 165.

(4) Lambe's case, 2 Leach Cr. C. 265. Milward v. Forbes, 4 Esp. N. P. C. 171.

(*a*) If the justice do not take down the confession of the prisoner in writing according to the directions of the act, the justice may, notwithstanding, prove the confession that was made to him; for there would be an impropriety in saying that evidence may be received of a confession made before a private man, and that the same confession made before a justice shall not, because he hath omitted to perform his duty. *State* v. *Irwin*, 1 *Hayw.* 112. Acc. *Hall's case*, Lent assizes, Stafford, 1790, 1 *M'Nally* 40. To authorize the admission of parol evidence of the prisoner's confession, it must be clearly proved that in fact his examination was never reduced to writing. 1 *M'Nally* 49, 50. 1 *Leach* 347. It does not appear necessary that the magistrate acting judicially under the directions of the statute, should, in order to make the written confession evidence, warn the prisoner of its effects against him on trial. 1 *M'Nally* 38.

statute of Philip and Mary requires the Justice to take the examination, *or so much thereof as is material*, &c. (*b*). The confession is evidence only against the person confessing, not against others, although they are proved to be his accomplices. It was resolved by all the judges in the case of Tong and others (5), on an indictment for high treason, that a confession by one of the prisoners was evidence only against the party himself who made the confession, and
* 83 could not *be made use of as evidence against any others, whom on his examination he confessed to be in the treason (*a*).

The confession of a prisoner is not to be taken in parts, but the whole together; that what is given in evidence may be neither more nor less than the prisoner intended. If the confession is not in writing, the whole of what the prisoner said must be fully stated, although it may happen that some part of it concerns other prisoners who are tried on the same indictment; in such a case it is not possible to make any selection, for, until the evidence has been heard, it cannot be known what it is, or to whom it relates; and all that can be done is to direct the jury not to take into their consideration such parts as affect the other prisoners. But a distinction might perhaps be made in this respect, in case the confession has been reduced into writing, if that part which relates to the other prisoners is capable of being separated and detached from the rest, and can be omitted without affecting in any degree the prisoner's narrative against himself.

It has been determined by all the judges, that, although confessions improperly obtained are not admissible, yet that

(5) Kelyng 18., res. 5. Gilb. Ev. 124.

(*b*) Vide Laws of New-York, sess. 36. c. 104. s. 2. 2 R. L. 507.

(*a*) It was determined in *Rex* v. *Carty*, 1 *M'Nally* 45. in Ireland, that where the accused makes a confession in conversation, and afterwards makes another confession before a magistrate, acting judicially, by taking down the same in writing, the conversation or parol confession may be given in evidence.

any facts, which have been brought to light in consequence of such confessions, may be properly received in evidence. Thus, where a prisoner was charged, as accessary after the fact, with having received property knowing it to be stolen, proof was admitted of the property being found concealed in the prisoner's lodgings, although the knowledge of that fact had been gained from an inadmissible confession (1). Some indeed have thought, that the circumstance, of the fact being known in consequence of information received from the prisoner, ought not to be shown at the trial. But a different practice appears to be established by later authorities; and, on a prosecution for receiving stolen goods, evidence has been admitted that the prisoner described the *place where the goods were concealed, and that afterwards they had been found there; but that part of the confession, in which he acknowledged that he himself had concealed them, was rejected, as it was improperly drawn from him (1). There is good reason for this distinction; for, what the prisoner has said respecting the concealment of the property, is ascertained to be true by the fact of the subsequent discovery, but the other part of the confession, in which he charges himself with having concealed it, may have been made untruly and entirely under the influence of the threat or promise (*a*). * 84

(1) Warwickshall's case, 1 Leach Cr. C. 300. Mosey's case, ib. n. (*a*). 301. Lockhart's case, ib. 430. 2 East P. C. 658. S. C.

(1) Grant's case, and Hoge's case, 2 East P. C. 658. 1 Leach Cr. C. 301. n. (*a*), S. C.

(*a*) Where a prisoner indicted for murder on being struck by the persons who took him, confessed that he killed the deceased, described the place where he had hid the body, and mentioned other circumstances, which were proved actually to have existed as he mentioned them, it was held, that a confession whether extorted or not, that relates a number of circumstances which the prisoner could not well be acquainted with but as perpetrator of the crime, all which circumstances are proved by the other testimony, to have actually existed, is such testimony as should be left to the consideration of a jury. *State* v. *Moore*, 1 *Hayw.* 482.

In cases of high treason.

There has been some difference of opinion, respecting the sufficiency of this kind of evidence in trials of high treason. The stat. of the 7th W. 3. c. 3. s. 2. enacts, "that no person shall be indicted, tried, or attainted, for high treason or misprision of high treason, but upon the oaths and testimony of two witnesses, either both of them to the same overt act, or one of them to one, and the other of them to another overt act of the same treason, unless the party indicted and arraigned shall willingly without violence in open court confess the same (*b*)." Mr. Justice Foster (2) seems to have been of opinion, that the legislature intended by this section to require two witnesses to the overt acts in all cases, except where the prisoner confessed the treason upon his arraignment in open court, and that to warrant a conviction there must be proof of the overt acts upon oath, not merely proof of the confession of the overt acts. "But, he adds (3), perhaps it may now be too late, to controvert the authority of the opinion in 1716, in Francia's case, warranted as it hath been by later precedents (4)." All the judges, on a conference preparatory to the trial of Francia (5), held, that a confession of the overt acts, if proved by two witnesses, would be sufficient to convict the prisoner (*c*). The same construction
* 85 *of the statute was adopted in Greg's case (1), by six judges against two: in Berwick's case (2), by Ld. C. J. Willes and Sir Thomas Abney against the opinion of Mr. Justice

(2) See Fost. Disc. 240. 243. Willis's case, ib. 242. Smith's case, ib.
(3) Fost. Disc. 243.
(4) See Fost. Disc. 11. note.
(5) Francia's case, 1716. Mr. J. Burnet's MS. 1 East P. C. 133.
(1) Greg's case, 1 East P. C. 134.
(2) Fost. Disc. 10.

(*b*) Vide Laws of New-York, sess. 24. c. 29. s. 5. 1 R. L. 145. which is a transcript of the English statute cited in the text. The constitution of the United States directs, that "no person shall be convicted of treason, unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court." Art. 3. sect. 3. vide act of April 30, 1790. 1 L. U. S. 100.

(*c*) Vide *Respublica* v. *M'Carty*, 2 *Dall.* 86.

Foster; and by the judges in the commission, on the trial of the rebels in 1746 (3).

With regard to all collateral facts, which do not conduce to the proof of the overt acts, it may be laid down as a general rule, that whatever was evidence of them at common law is still good evidence under the statute (4). Such facts may therefore be proved by a single witness. Thus, in Vaughan's case (5), where the prisoner endeavoured to prove himself a subject of France, the counsel for the crown produced evidence of his being born in Ireland; and, on its being objected by the prisoner's counsel, that there was but one credible witness to that fact, Lord Holt, C. J. said, "that it is no overt act; if there be one witness to that, it is enough: there need not be two witnesses, to prove him a subject."

From the above-cited cases, it appears now to be an established rule, that a full and voluntary confession by the prisoner of the overt acts charged against him is of itself sufficient evidence to warrant a conviction. And, although Mr. Justice Foster suggests (6), that "the rule, for admitting a confession against the prisoner, ought not to extend further than to a confession made during the solemnity of an examination before a magistrate or before some person having authority to take it, when the party may be presumed to be properly upon his guard and apprised of its danger," no distinction of this kind is to be found in the authorities before mentioned. On the contrary, in Francia's case the judges resolved, that the confession would be evidence, whether made before a magistrate or in *the course of conversation (1). And there appears to be no solid ground for such a distinction; as confessions are admissible in trials for high treason, precisely on the same principle, which made them evidence at common law. The observations of Mr. Justice Foster relate to the effect

* 86

(3) Fost. Disc. p. 11. n. (†). 1 East P. C. 134.

(4) Fost. Disc. 242.

(5) 5 State Tr. 17. Fost. Disc. 240.

(6) Fost. Disc. 243. 4 Black. Com. 356.

(1) See Burnet, J. MS. cited 1 East P. C. 133., and Kelyng 19.

rather than to the admissibility of this sort of evidence, and are equally applicable to confessions in any other criminal case. "Hasty confessions, he says, (2), made to persons having no authority to examine, are the weakest and most suspicious of all evidence. Proof may be too easily procured: words are often mis-reported, (whether through ignorance, inattention, or malice—it mattereth not to the defendant—he is equally affected in either case:) they are extremely liable to misconstruction: and withal, this evidence is not, in the ordinary course of things, to be disproved by that sort of negative evidence, by which the proof of plain facts may be and often is confronted."

Sect. VI.

Of the Admissibility of the Party injured, as Witness in Criminal Prosecutions.

It is a general rule, that in criminal prosecutions the injured party may be a witness: although on the conviction of the prisoner he will in many cases be entitled to a reward.*

(2) Fost. Disc. 243.

* A reward of 40l. is granted for apprehending and prosecuting to conviction highway robbers, (4 W. & M. c. 3. s. 2.,) offenders against the acts for preventing counterfeited coin, &c. (St. 6 W. 3. c. 17. s. 9.: 15 G. 2. c. 28. s. 7.,) prisoners charged with burglary or breaking and entering houses in the day-time, (St. 5 Ann. c. 31. s. 4.,) or charged with taking rewards for helping to stolen goods without prosecuting the felon, (St. 6 G. 1. c. 23. s. 9.) A reward of 50l. is granted for apprehending and convicting smugglers who oppose custom-house and excise officers by force of arms, &c. (St. 9 G. 2. c. 35. s. 11.,) or offenders against the Black Act, (St. 9 G. 1. c. 22. s. 12.:) and a reward of 10l. for apprehending and convicting stealers of sheep or other cattle. The apprehenders of highway robbers are also entitled to the robber's goods found upon him, provided they were not before stolen. By the stat. 21 Hen. 8. c. 11., the person from whom money or goods have been stolen, is entitled to restitution, on the conviction of the robber. By the stat. 5 Eliz. c. 9. s. 8., persons con-

It is the constant practice on an indictment for robbery, to admit the evidence of the person who has been robbed; and it is not a sufficient objection, that he will be entitled to the restitution of his property, on the conviction of the offender (*a*). The same evidence is admitted in prosecutions for a cheat (1), or for perjury (2); and, in the case of perjury, it is not material, whether he has or has not satisfied the judgment in the suit in which the perjury was committed. It was, indeed, at one time thought an indispensable requisite to show the judgment satisfied (3); on the supposition, that in case of his procuring a conviction, he might use it for the purpose of obtaining relief in equity against the judgment. But, as it is now an established rule, that a court of equity will not grant relief on a conviction, which proceeds on the evidence of the prosecutor (4), there can be no objection to his being admitted a

(1) Parris's case, 1 Vent. 49. 2 Sid. 431. S. C. R. v. Macartney, 1 Salk. 286.

(2) R. v. Broughton, 2 Str. 1230. R. v. Boston, 4 East 581. contra. R. v. Ellis, 2 Str. 1104. R. v. Nunez, 2 Str. 1042., R. v. Whiting, 1 Salk. 283. But Lord Mansfield, in Abraham q. t. v. Bunn, 4 Burr. 2255. cites the case of R. v. Broughton as overruling the three last mentioned cases.

(3) R. v. Eden, 1 Esp. N. C. P. 97. R. v. Dalby, Peake N. P. C. 12. (*b*).

(4) Bartlet v. Pickersgill, cited in Abraham v. Bunn, 4 Burr. 2255. by Ld. Mansfield, C. J., and in R. v. Boston, 4 East 577. by Ld. Ellenborough.

victed of perjury within that act are subject to certain forfeitures, a moiety of which is for the party grieved, and to be recovered by action. By St. 25 G. 2. c. 36. s. 11., in case of a conviction of felony, the prosecutor is entitled to his expenses of prosecution, as may seem reasonable to the Court, on consideration of his circumstances; and, in the case of a writ of certiorari obtained by a person who had been indicted before the quarter sessions, the party injured prosecuting will be entitled to costs on the conviction of the defendant, by St. 5, 6 W. 3. c. 11. s. 3. It may be observed generally, of all those cases, that such circumstances will not affect the *competency* of the witness. If his evidence were to be excluded, the very object of the legislature would in most cases be entirely defeated.

(*a*) Vide *Commonwealth* v. *Moulton*, 9 *Mass. Rep.* 30.

(*b*) Vide *Rex* v. *D'Faria*, *Peake* 104, which was an indictment for perjury in a suit in the prerogative court respecting a will, and the will having been established, the executrix and residuary legatee was held a competent witness.

witness (*c*). And in other cases, the party aggrieved will
* 88 be allowed to give *evidence on a criminal prosecution, as he cannot afterwards avail himself of the record of conviction in any future suit, in order to prove the criminal act (1). For this reason, it is conceived, on an indictment for perjury the party injured may be a witness, whether the prosecution is by the common law or founded on the stat. 5 Eliz. c. 9., which gives him half the forfeiture incurred; for, if in an action to recover his moiety he would be precluded from giving the conviction in evidence, the objection against his competency seems to be removed.*

In the case of forgery.

An exception, however, has been made to this general rule, in the case of a prosecution for forgery, in which the party, by whom an instrument purports to be made, is not admitted to prove it forged, if he would either be liable to be sued upon the instrument, (supposing it genuine), or be thereby deprived of a legal claim against another (2). And it seems to be the prevailing opinion, that his incompetency is not confined to the single point of falsifying the handwriting, but that he is equally incompetent to prove any other fact, which contributes to the proof of the forgery, or, in other words, any fact conducive to the general conclusion. This subject was much discussed in a late case (3),

(1) Bartlet v. Pickersgill, 4 East 577. n. (*b*). R. v. Boston, 4 East 581. Smith v. Rummens, 1 Campb. N. P. C. 9. Hathaway v. Barrow, 1 Campb. N. P. C. 151. 1 Taunt. 520.

(2) Watt's case, Hard. 331. 3 Salk. 172. S. C. Rhodes's case, 2 Str. 728. 1 Leach Cr. C. 29. S. C. Russel's case, 1 Leach 10. Caffy's case, 2 East's P. C. 995. Taylor's case, 1 Leach 255. Crocker's case, 2 New Rep. 87.

(3) Crocker's case, Salisb. Ass. 1805, cor. Le Blanc, J., 2 Bos. and Pul. N. R. 87. 90. R. v. Bunting, 2 East P. C. 996.

* Ruled contra in an old case; Bacon's case, 2 Roll. Abr. 685; Bull. N. P. 289. S. C. Gilb. Ev. 111. S. C.

(*c*) Vide *State* v. *Hasset*, *Tayl.* 55. On an indictment under the act of Congress of March 26, 1804, for destroying a vessel at sea, with intent to prejudice the underwriters, the president of the Insurance Company was admitted to prove the order for insurance, and the subscription to the policy. *The United States* v. *Johns*, 4 *Dall.* 412.

where, on a prosecution for forging a promissory note, on which there was an indorsement in the prisoner's handwriting, that a year's interest had been paid, one of the points reserved was, whether the person, by whom the note purported to be made, ought to have been permitted to prove that he had never paid any interest on the note, *as was pretended by the indorsement. This evidence was received on the trial, the fact of the forgery having been first proved; but, according to the report, it seems to have been generally understood that the majority of the judges considered the evidence inadmissible.* When, however, the fact is merely collateral, and does not in any way contribute to the proof of the forgery, as, where a witness is called to prove himself the person, whom the prisoner intended to personate or describe, in such a case his testimony has been admitted (1). * 89

It is scarcely necessary to add, that if the witness would not incur any loss, nor be liable to a suit, whatever may be the result of the prosecution, his evidence ought to be received (*a*). Thus, on an indictment for forging a bank note, in the name of a cashier of the bank of England "for the governor and company," the cashier, not being chargeable, may be a witness (2). And on a prosecution for forg-

(1) Parr's case, 2 Leach Cr. C. 487. 491. 2 East P. C. 997. S. C. C. 350.

(2) Newland's case, 1 Leach, Cr.

* Lord Ellenborough, C. J., the Chief Baron Macdonald, Mr. Justice Lawrence, and Mr. Justice Le Blanc, thought the witness admissible, because it had been sufficiently proved before, that the note was not signed by him; and they thought him admissible to all points except that of the forgery. Some of the other judges seemed to think, that to points perfectly collateral he would have been admissible, but they considered the point, to which he was called, as contributing to prove the forgery. M. S.

(*a*) But in a case at the Old Bailey, *Sept.* 1792, the obligor in a bond being indicted for altering a receipt for interest, so as to make it appear a receipt for principal and interest, Mr. Baron *Hotham* held the obligee to be an incompetent witness, although he had obtained a verdict invalidating the receipt, as judgment had not been entered up. 2 *Evan's Poth.* 315.

ing an acceptance to a bill of exchange, where the banker had paid the bill, but suspecting a forgery, had not debited the person whose name was forged, this person was admitted to give evidence (3).

Upon what principle, it may be asked, is a party, by whom an instrument purports to be made, incompetent to prove it forged? In Watt's case (4), on an information
* 90 for *the forgery of a deed purporting to be the revocation of a will, it was adjudged by the barons of the exchequer after a conference with the judges of the King's Bench, that no legatee named in the will, nor any other person who is a loser by the deed, or who may receive any advantage from the verdict, can be a witness for the prosecution: and a distinction was made between the case of an indictment for a battery, (where, it was admitted, the person beaten may be witness, because he can reap no benefit by the verdict in another suit,) and the cases of forgery, perjury, or usury, in which, it was said, the party aggrieved may have an advantage by the verdict, and therefore, shall not be received as a witness. It is, however, now an established rule, that on a prosecution for perjury (1) the party aggrieved is competent: and, that a person who has borrowed money on an usurious transaction, is also a competent witness for the plaintiff in an action for penalties against the lender (2); for he gains nothing by the event of the suit, nor can he give the judgment in evidence in an action against him for the money lent. The case of forgery, therefore, stands by itself, and is considered an anomaly in the law of evidence. The reason assigned in Watt's case is, that the witness would receive a benefit from the verdict; and it has been suggested (3), that he is interested

(3) Usher's case, 1 Leach Cr. C. 57.; and see Well's case, Bull. N. P. 289. 2 East P. C. 1000. S. C.; Sponsonby's case, 1 Leach Cr. C. 374.

(4) Watt's case, 3 Salk. 172., more fully reported in Hardr. 331. See 4 Burr. 2254., Where Ld. Mansfield says, that this and other cases of the same kind "were not considered or looked into."

(1) See ante, p. 87. (*a*).

(2) Abraham q. t. v. Bunn, 4 Burr. 2251. Smith v. Prager, 7 T. R. 60. See ante, p. 39.

(3) 2 East P. C. 994.

to procure a conviction, on the ground that a conviction would have the effect of inducing a forfeiture, and thus defeat every legal claim or security which the prisoner might have upon the instrument. On the other hand, it may be said, if the party, by whom the instrument purports to be made, were admitted a witness, he would not be allowed afterwards to produce the record of conviction in a civil suit for the purpose of proving the supposed forfeiture, because the parties in the action would not be the same as in the prosecution, but principally, because the conviction must have proceeded partly upon his own testimony. And, if he would be precluded *from using the record of conviction against the prisoner, and might, therefore, be admitted to give evidence on the trial consistently with the general rule; still less reason is there for excluding him in those cases, where the instrument purports to be made for the benefit of a third person, or where it has since become a third person's property, in either of which cases it would not be liable to forfeiture. With regard to any probable advantage which the witness may be supposed to receive from a conviction, (whether by the practice of impounding forged instruments, or by the prisoner's being disabled from giving evidence in any future suit, or from the great probability of his failing in an action in consequence of the discredit which a conviction must throw upon the instrument,) these are circumstances which a jury would be directed to consider as forming a strong bias on the witness's mind, but which cannot render him incompetent (*a*). * 91

(*a*) The rule that a party by whom an instrument purports to be made, is incompetent to prove it forged, has not generally been acquiesced in, in this country. In Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, a contrary doctrine has been established. *Commonwealth* v. *Hutchinson*, 1 *Mass. Rep.* 7. *Commonwealth* v. *Snell*, 3 *Mass. Rep.* 82. *Respublica* v. *Keating*, 1 *Dall.* 110. *Respublica* v. *Ross*, 2 *Dall.* 239. Mr. Day considers the law in Connecticut as unsettled on this point, 2 *New Rep. Day's Ed.* 96. n. (1). The English rule was adopted by the Supreme Court of the state of New-York in

Sect. VII.

Of certain Exceptions to the general Rule on the Subject of Interest.

It has been before stated as a general rule, that all persons, who gain or lose directly by the event of a cause, are incompetent to give evidence. There are, however, several exceptions to this general rule: some, by act of parliament, as, where informers and the inhabitants of parishes or other districts are admitted; others from necessity or a principle of public policy, as, where evidence is

---

a case in 1794; on which Ch. J. Kent makes the following remarks: "The grounds or reasons of that decision are not before the public, and we, therefore, do not know them. It is probable that the Court assumed the English rule, as they found it then existing. But since that time the question of interest in a witness has been investigated and defined with more precision, both in *England* and in this state. The rule now, in all such cases, and I believe I may say in almost all criminal cases is, that the witness is to be received, if he be not interested in the event of the suit, so that the verdict could be given in evidence in an action in which he was a party. The interest which the witness may have in the question put, is no longer the test. That degree of interest goes only to the credit of the witness. The exclusion of the witness in the case of forgery has, therefore, now become an anomaly in the law of evidence, for it is certain, that the conviction of the party charged with forging a check, cannot be given in evidence in a subsequent civil suit on the check; and as the reason of the old rule has ceased, by a sounder definition of the question of interest, and as it is not now applied to other criminal cases, it would seem to be fit and proper, that the rule itself should no longer be applied to the case of forgery. But the present case does not turn upon the validity of that rule, and therefore the court do not now interfere with it." *The People* v. *Howell*, 4 *Johns. Rep.* 296. 302, 303. In the case last cited, a check had been forged in the name of Butler, on the Mer-

received from persons who are entitled to rewards on convictions, or from agents, factors, or servants. Objections on the ground of interest proceed upon the supposition of too great a bias in the mind of the witness, and the public utility of rejecting partial testimony. The presumption of bias may be taken off, by showing, that the witness has as great or greater interest the other way, or that he has given it up; and the presumption of public utility may be answered, by showing, *that it would be very inconvenient, under the particular circumstances, not to receive such testimony (1). * 92

First, as to the evidence of informers:

Informers.

By the common law, informers, who are entitled under penal statutes to part of a penalty (*a*), are not competent witnesses (2). But by the particular provisions or policy

(1) By Lord Mansfield. 1 Burr. 422.

(2) R. v. Tilly, 1 Stra. 315. R. v. Stone, 2 Lord Raym. 1545. R. v. Blaney, Andr. 240. 3 Burr. 1473. 4 East 181.

---

chant's Bank, and was sent by one Cooper to his agent at New-York, who received the money at the bank and remitted it to Cooper: the check was afterwards discovered to be a forgery, and the bank got possession of the money before it reached the hands of Cooper: on an indictment for the forgery, Butler was held to be a competent witness to prove the forgery, he having been released by the bank, and not being liable to Cooper for the money, even if the check were genuine, the bank having acted without his direction.—Vide post, 98. In Massachusetts the person whose name is alleged to be forged, cannot be a witness unless the instrument is produced at the trial. *Commonwealth* v. *Hutchinson*, *ubi sup.* But the production of it may be dispensed with, if it has been secreted to protect the offender. *Commonwealth* v. *Snell*, *ubi sup.*

(*a*) S. P. *Commonwealth* v. *Frost*, 5 *Mass. Rep.* 57, 58. Although the informer suing in his own name release his interest, he cannot be a witness, for he will still be liable for the costs. *Rapp* v. *Le Blanc et al.* 1 *Dall.* 68. On a summary conviction, where the informer receives part of the penalty, he cannot be a witness; for which reason it is requisite to name the witness in the conviction, that it may appear that he is not the same person with the informer. 1 *Wms. Saund.* 262. c. *New-York Just.* 83.

of several acts of parliament, they may be admitted. Where a statute can receive no execution, unless a party interested be a witness, there he must be allowed, says Ch. B. Gilbert; for the statute must not be rendered ineffectual by the impossibility of proof (3). Thus, by stat. 2 G. 2. c. 24. s. 8. against bribery at elections, the legislature in giving an indemnity and discharge to any person offending against the act, who shall discover any other offender so that he may be committed, must also have intended that he should be competent to give evidence at the trial; and, therefore, in an action for penalties he has been admitted (4). So, in a prosecution on stat. 21 G. 3. c. 37. against exporting machinery, the informer is competent (5). So, on a prosecution for penalties under stat. 9 Ann. c. 14. s. 5., the loser of money at cards may prove his loss (6). And, on a prosecution under stat. 23 G. 2. c. 13. s. 1. for seducing artificers to go out of the kingdom, the prosecutor is a competent witness, although entitled to a moiety of the penalty (7). There is no *express* provision in either of the three acts of parliament last mentioned, for admitting the evidence of the party interested. In the act of the 32 G. 3. c. 56. for preventing counterfeited certificates of servants' characters, there is a clause (8)
* 93 to that effect; and a similar *provision is made by the act which regulates hackney coaches, stat. 33 G. 3. c. 75. s. 17 (*a*).

(3) Gilb. Ev. 114.
(4) Bush v. Ralling, Say. 289. Mead v. Robinson, Willes 425. Heward v. Shipley, 4 East 182.
(5) R. v. Teasdale, 3 Esp. N. P. C. 68.
(6) R. v. Luckup, Willes 425. (*c*).
(7) R. v. Johnson, Willes Rep. 425. n. (*c*).
(8) Sect. 7.

(*a*) Where the court may, at their discretion, inflict either a corporal punishment or impose a fine, the informer is a competent witness, as it is only in case a fine is imposed, that the witness can expect to derive any benefit, and that is uncertain as depending upon the judgment of the court. *Rex* v. *Cole*, 1 *Esp.* 169. S. C. *Peake* 217. Contra. *Rex* v. *Blackman*, 1 *Esp.* 95.

Inhabitants of counties, parishes, &c.

Secondly, On an indictment against private persons or corporate bodies for not repairing a public bridge or the highway adjoining, the inhabitants of the county, town, riding, &c. in which the bridge is situated, are competent witnesses in support of the prosecution, by the 1st Ann. stat. 1. c. 18. s. 13. Even before this statute, such evidence had been thought admissible (1) from necessity.

In an action by a party robbed against the hundred, the inhabitants of the hundred may be witnesses for the defendants, by stat. 8 G. 2. c. 16. s. 15. Before this act passed, they were not competent, because any one of them would have been liable to pay the debt, in case of judgment against the hundred (2).

In all cases relative to the execution of the highway act, the surveyor of the parish or place is a competent witness, though part of his salary may arise from forfeitures and penalties inflicted under the act (3). And, on trials of offences against the same act, the inhabitants of the parish or place are also competent (4).

Where pecuniary penalties are directed to be applied to the use of the poor, or for the benefit and exoneration of the parish or other place, the inhabitants are rendered competent witnesses on the trial of the offender, by stat. 27 G. 3. c. 29. provided the penalty inflicted by the act of parliament does not exceed twenty pounds (5).

It has been lately provided by stat. 54 G. 3. c. 170. s. 9., that no inhabitant of any district, parish, &c., who is *rated, or who is maintained by the rates, or who holds any office in the district, shall be deemed on such account an incompetent witness, for or against such district, parish, &c., in any matter relating to such rates, or relating to the boundary between such district and any adjoining district, or to any order of removal to or from such district, or to *94

(1) Per Cur. in R. v. Carpenter, 2 Show. 47.

(2) Per Cur. in R. v. Carpenter, 2 Show. 47. 2 Hal. P. C. 280. R. v. Kirdford, 2 East 561.

(3) Stat. 13 G. 3. c. 78. s. 69.

(4) Sect. 77. and Stat. 30 G. 2. c. 22. s. 14.

(5) R. v. Davis, 6 T. R. 177.

the settlement of any pauper in such district, or touching any bastards chargeable, or likely to become chargeable, to such district, or touching the recovery of any sum for the charges or maintenance of such bastard, or the election or appointment of any officer, or the allowance of the account of any officer of such district.

Persons entitled to rewards.

Thirdly, persons entitled to rewards on the conviction of offenders, whether the rewards are given by act of parliament (*a*), proclamation, or by private persons, and persons entitled to the restitution of their property on the conviction of a thief, are competent to give evidence (1).

Agents, &c.

Fourthly, it is the constant practice to admit agents to be witnesses for their principals, in order to prove contracts made by them on the part of the principal; and this is allowed from necessity, or rather for the sake of trade and the common usage of business (*b*). Thus, a factor may prove a sale, though he is to receive a poundage on its amount (2) (*c*) or what he has bargained for beyond a stated sum (3). And every person who makes a contract for another is an agent within the meaning of this rule (4). So, where the question was on the custom of a manor, whether a fine was due to the lord during his minority on the tenant's admission, the steward of the manor was

(1) Per Cur. in Rudd's case, Leach Cr. C. 157, 158. Ib. 353. n. Hawk. P. C. b. 2. c. 46. s. 135. See ante, p. 86.

(2) Dixon v. Cooper, 3 Wils. 40. 1 Atk. 248.

(3) Benjamin v. Porteus, 2 H. Bl. 590. R. v. Phipps, Bull. N. P. 289.

(4) 2 H. Black. 591.

(*a*) S. P. *State* v. *Coulter*, 1 *Hayw.* 3.

(*b*) Vide *Mackay* v. *Rhinelander and others*, 1 *Johns. Cas.* 408. *Jones* v. *Hake*, 2 *Johns. Cas.* 60. *Burlingham* v. *Deyer*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 189. *Ruan* v. *Gardner*, 2 *Condy's Marsh.* 706. *b.*

(*c*) But a collector of taxes who was to receive a commission on the amount of cash paid into the treasury, was held an incompetent witness; this not being a case to which the rule arising from necessity and the usage of trade extended. *Treasurer of the State* v. *Nall*, *Tayl.* 5.

allowed to give evidence for the lord, though it was objected to him, that he would be entitled to a fee on admission, which he would lose, *if the tenant were not admitted (1). And freemen, as was before mentioned, have been allowed to be witnesses in certain cases, although interested, from mere necessity. *95

On the same principle of convenience, it is the common practice to admit servants and agents, without a release, to prove the payment or receipt of money, or the delivery of goods, on behalf of their master or principal, though their evidence tends to discharge themselves (2). Thus, if money has been overpaid by a servant or paid by mistake, he is a competent witness, in an action to recover it back (3) (*a*). But where a person has entered into a contract for the purchase of goods *in his own name*, it has been held that he is not a competent witness in an action for goods sold and delivered to prove that he purchased them as *the agent* for the defendant (4). If the agent is equally liable to either party, and indifferent in point of interest, whichever way the verdict may be, he is clearly a competent witness on the general principle (5) (*b*). The practice of admitting servants without a release, to prove a delivery of goods, or the payment of money, and the like, is for public convenience, "for the sake of trade and the com-

(1) Champian v. Atkinson, 3 Keb. 90. Rep. temp. Hard. 360. See R. v. Phipps and Archer, ante, p. 59.

(2) Per Holt, C. J. in Theobald v. Tregott, 11 Mod. 262. Bull. N. P. 289. 4 T. R. 589, 590. Matthews v. Haydon, 2 Esp. N. P. C. 509. Spencer v. Golding, Peake N. P. C. 129. Adams v. Davis, 3 Esp. N. P. C. 48.

(3) Martin v. Howel, 1 Str. 647. Barker v. Macrae, 3 Campb. 144.

(4) M'Braine v. Fortune, 3 Campb. 317.

(5) See ante, p. 53.

(*a*) S. P. *Cortes* v. *Billings*, 1 *Johns. Cas.* 270. vide 1 *Hen. & Mun.* 540.

(*b*) An agent or broker, authorized to purchase goods on certain terms, is a competent witness in a suit between the vendor and vendee; for if he had exceeded his authority, he would at all events be liable to the losing party, and if he had not, he would be liable to neither. *Bailey & Bogert* v. *Ogden*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 399.

mon usage of business (6)." This sufficiently explains the principle, and at the same time shows the restrictions to which the practice is subject (*c*). Where the act of the servant has been out of the ordinary course of his employment, and a mere breach of duty, the principle does not apply: and it has therefore been ruled at Nisi Prius, that in such a case the servant is not a witness for his master without a release. Thus, in an action to recover back money, which had been entrusted to the plaintiff's servant
*96 for a special purpose, and paid by *the servant in illegal insurances, he was considered incompetent without a release (1). And in an action against the defendant for the negligence of his servant, he is not competent to disprove the fact of his negligence (2): for since the verdict might be given in evidence in an action by the defendant against

(6) Bull. N. P. 289.

(1) Corking v. Jarrard, 1 Campb. 37. In Clarke v. Shee, Cowp. 199, which was a similar case, a release was given. See anonymous case, 1 Salk. 289.; Bull. N. P. 39. 289. S. C.; and anonymous case, Bull. N. P. 290. These were actions by a master to recover property embezzled by his servant, and the servant was admitted a witness to prove delivery to the defendant; but it does not appear whether the plaintiff gave a release.

(2) Green v. New Riv. Comp. 4 T. R. 589. 3 Camp. 516. 523. Bird v. Thompson, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 339. Miller v. Falconer, 1 Campb. 251. 6 Esp. N. P. C. 73.

(*c*) The master of a vessel is a competent witness in an action on a policy of insurance, although interested to fix the loss on the underwriter to avoid his own responsibility by the bill of lading. *Hicks* v. *Fitzsimmons*, 2 *Condy's Marsh.* 706. *b.* Vide *Wallace* v. *Child & Styles*, 1 *Dall.* 7.

In an action of assumpsit on a promissory note, made on the coast of Africa to pay a certain number of slaves, &c. on demand, it was held that the letters of the agent of the plaintiff, since deceased, were admissible to prove the demand made in Africa; as the agent was sent to make the demand, in a country where there was no regular civil government, and not having any magistrates or notaries authorized to take and certify affidavits, or regularly to authenticate testimony in any manner: and as no cause was then pending or expected, it could not be required that he should take with him a *dedimus potestatem.* *Greenwood* v. *Curtis*, 6 *Mass. Rep.* 358.

the witness, as to the quantum of damages, the servant is directly interested to defeat the action, and does not come within the exception above specified (*a*).

Sect. VIII.

Of the means by which the Competency of an interested Witness may be restored.

The last question that remains to be considered on this part of our subject, relates to the regular mode of making the objection to the competency of a witness, and to the means of restoring his competency (*b*).

The rule formerly was that the objection ought to be made on the voire dire, and was not to be allowed after the examination in chief. But for the convenience of the court,

---

(*a*) An agent may testify without producing the power under which he acts. *Renaudet* v. *Crocken*, 1 *Caines' Rep.* 167. It has been held that an agent was not a competent witness to prove that a written authority had been given him, but that the contents of the writing must be proved by other witnesses. *Nicholson's Lessee* v. *Mifflin*, 2 *Dall.* 246. He is however competent to give evidence of oral instructions. *Livingston et al.* v. *Swanwick*, *Ibid.* 300. In a case in Connecticut, a witness acting in pursuance of written orders, as the agent of the person under whom the defendant claimed, was not allowed on behalf of the defendant, to give evidence of the contents of those orders, without producing them. *Stewart* v. *Richards*, 1 *Day's Esp.* 406. *n.* (1): for the written appointment is the best evidence, and must be produced, unless proved to be lost or destroyed. *The Proprietors of the Kennebeck Purchase* v. *Call*, 1 *Mass. Rep.* 483.

(*b*) Proof of a declaration by the witness previous to the trial, that he was interested, or incompetent, is not sufficient to exclude him. *Commonwealth* v. *Waite*, 5 *Mass. Rep.* 261. But where it is proved that the party by whom the witness is introduced, has acknowledged him so interested, the witness ought not to be sworn. *Pierce* v. *Chase*, 8 *Mass. Rep.* 487.

and because the incompetency may not at first be suspected, a greater latitude has been allowed. And now, if it is discovered during any part of the trial that a witness is interested, his evidence will be struck out (3) (*c*).

When the objection arises from a witness's answer on the voire dire, it may be likewise removed on the voire dire. The party who calls him may examine as to the
* 97 *continuance of his interest, and need not give the best and strictest proof of his competency being restored. Thus, where, in an action brought by a chartered company, a witness for the plaintiffs admitted on the voire dire, that he had been a freeman of the company, but added that he was then disfranchised, Lord Kenyon ruled at Nisi Prius, that it was not necessary to prove the disfranchisement by the regular entry in the company's books, and that the witness was competent (1). And, in a later case, on a question of settlement, where the point for the consideration of the

(3) Turner v. Pearte, 1 T. R. 720. Perigal v. Nicholson, 1 Wightwick 64. Howel v. Lock, 2 Campb. N. P. C. 14.

(1) Butchers' Company v. Jones, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 162. acc. Botham v. Swingler, Peake N. P. C. 218; 1 Esp. N. P. C. 164. S. C.

(*c*) Vide post 204, 205. And the rule in equity is, that if the incompetency of the witness be discovered in any stage of the cause, his deposition may be suppressed. *Needham* v. *Smith*, 2 *Vern.* 463. *Swift* v. *Dean*, 6 *Johns. Rep.* 523.

There are two preliminary modes of proving a witness to be interested in a cause:—first, by examining him on the voire dire; or, secondly, by showing his interest from other evidence, either parol or written. But both these methods cannot be pursued at the same time; for the election of the one conclusively bars any subsequent recourse to the other. *Mifflin et al.* v. *Bingham*, 1 *Dall.* 272. *Bridge* v. *Wellington*, 1 *Mass. Rep.* 219. *Peake's Ev.* 186. 10 *Mod.* 193. 2 *Hayw.* 145. It is immaterial whether the witness has been examined as to his interest under the form of the voire dire, or under the general oath to witnesses; in neither case can testimony be produced to render him incompetent, and the rule applies equally to depositions taken before a magistrate. *Butler* v. *Butler*, 3 *Day* 214.

Court of King's Bench was, whether a witness produced by the appellants could be examined, after having admitted in his examination on the voire dire that he was the occupier of a cottage in the appellant township, but that he had never been charged with or paid any public rate or tax in that township, the court held, that there was no ground for objecting to his testimony, and that it was not necessary for the appellants to produce the rate, in order to negative the rating (2).

Whatever interest a witness may have had, if he is divested of it by release or payment or any other means, when he is ready to be sworn, there is no objection to his competency (*a*). Thus it is said "to have been solemnly

(2) R. v. Gisburn, 15 East 57.

(*a*) *Cortes* v. *Billings*, 1 *Johns. Cas.* 270. *Hasbrouck* v. *Lown*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 377. *Lessee of Henry* v. *Morgan & Cox*, 2 *Binney* 497. *Hooper & others* v. *Royster & wife*, 1 *Mun.* 119. *Ball* v. *Barnes et al.* 1 *Mass. Rep.* 73. In an action by the indorsee of a bill of exchange against one of the indorsors, the immediate preceding indorsor was offered by the plaintiff as a witness, and it was proposed, in order to render him competent, to strike his name off of the first and third bills of the set, which were the only bills in the plaintiff's possession, the second, on which the protest was made, being, as was alleged, lost in its passage from England to America; but the court held that the witness would still be inadmissible, for the second bill might be in the possession of a *bona fide* purchaser, who would be entitled to sue the witness upon it, notwithstanding any act of the plaintiff on this occasion. *Steinmetz et al.* v. *Currie*, 1 *Dall.* 269. There are cases in which the interest of a witness may be so situated that it cannot be extinguished by a release; a release technically operates only upon a present interest; but when there is a present right to take effect *in futuro*, such a right may be presently released. *Co. Litt.* 265. *a. Woods* v. *Williams*, 9 *Johns. Rep.* 123. *Jacobson* v. *Fountain*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 170. *Abby* v. *Goodrich*, 3 *Day* 433. Where the deposition of a witness is taken, who is interested at the time of taking it, it cannot be read on the trial, although the witness may subsequently have been released, or otherwise become disinterested.

agreed by the judges, that where a person had a legacy given him and did release it, he was a good witness to
* 98 prove the will (3)*." *So on a trial for forgery, a release from the holder of a promissory note to the supposed drawer, in whose name it was forged, (there being no other name on the note to whom the drawer could be liable,) made him a competent witness to prove the forgery of his hand-writing (1). To restore the competency of a bankrupt, (who, from being interested to increase the fund, cannot be admitted to prove property in himself or a debt due to his estate) (2), it must be shown, that he has obtained his certificate and given to the assignees a release of his share in the surplus and in the dividends (3). If he gives a general release to his assignees, it is sufficient: as it discharges him from receiving any sum of money from the assignees (4). But no release can make the bankrupt

(3) Vin. Ab. tit. Evidence, 14. n. 58. cited by Ld. Mansfield. 1 Burr. 423.

(1) Akehurst's case, 1 Leach Cr. C. 178. Dr. Dodd's case, ib. 184.

(2) See ante, p. 51.

(3) Ewens v. Gold, Bull. N. P. 43.

(4) Nares v. Saxby, cited 2 T. R. 497.

* Lord Chancellor Hardwicke established the will of Lord Ailesbury on similar proof, in the year 1748. (See 1 Burr. 427.) And in Wyndham v. Chetwynd, (1 Burr. 414.,) where the subscribing witnesses were creditors of the testator, as their debts had be[illegible]paid, they were admitted to prove the will. So in Doe dem. Hindson v. [illegible]ersey, (4 Burn Ec. Law, 97.) three of the judges were of opinion, that a subscribing witness w[illegible]restored to his competency, if all his interest had been released or extinguished at the *time of the examination*. Lee, C. J. in Anstey v. Dowsing, (2 Str. 1253.,) and Ld. Camden, C. J. in Doe on the demise of Hindson v. Kersey were of opinion, that if a subscribing witness was interested at *the time of attestation*, nothing *ex post facto* could give effect to his attestation. In the former of these cases, Mr. Justice Dennison differed from Lee, C. J. on this point. (See 1 Burr. 427, 8.)

Heyl v. *Burling*, 1 *Caines' Rep.* 14. 3 *Binney* 311. After a release, the witness is exactly upon the footing of every other witness sworn in any cause, and ought not to be confined to any particular point, but may be examined on every point necessary respecting the merits on either side. *Carrol* v. *M'Whorter*, 2 *Bay* 463.

a witness to prove his own act of bankruptcy (5). And, after a second bankruptcy, he cannot be a witness to increase the fund, even with a certificate and release, unless he has paid fifteen shillings in the pound; for, in the event of his not making that payment under the second commission, his future effects are liable (6).

When a witness is objected to as the member of a corporation, whose interests are in question, his competency may be restored either by his resignation, (which will be effectual even by parol, provided that it has been accepted, and another person elected in his place) (7), or by disfranchisement.

*The method of disfranchisement is said to be by an information in the nature of a quo warranto against the member, who then confesses the information, and upon that there is judgment of disfranchisement (1). This judgment must be such as cannot be avoided: for if it appears that the witness can avoid the judgment for irregularity, (as when he had never been summoned, and knew nothing of his disfranchisement,) he is not competent (2). *99

A release is in some cases unnecessary. And the witness though interested will be admitted without a release.

1. As, first, where the witness offers to surrender or release his interest, and does all in his power to clear away every objection to his testimony, but the other party refuses to accept it, in that case (*a*) the evidence of the witness may be received (3). Or if the party, on whose side the witness is interested, makes an offer to remove all interest, and the witness refuses, that will not deprive the party of his testimony. In the case of Anstey v. Dow-

(5) Field v. Curtis, 2 Str. 829. See ante, p. 51.

(6) By st. 5 G. 2. c. 30. s. 9. Kennet v. Greenwollers, Peake N. P. C. 3.

(7) R. v. Mayor, &c. of Rippon, 2 Salk. 432. Com. Dig. tit. Franchise, (F. 30.)

(1) The case of the Mayor, &c. of Colchester, 1 P. Wms. 595. n.

(2) Brown v. Corp. of London, 11 Mod. 225.

(3) Goodtitle dem. Fowler v. Welford, 1 Doug. 139. 3 T. R. 35.

(*a*) Vide 2 *Johns. Rep.* 176.

sing (4), indeed Lee, J. expressed an opinion that a legatee was not competent to prove the due execution of the will, although payment of the legacy was tendered to him, which tender he refused. But the ground of this opinion was, that even if he had accepted the legacy, he still would have been incompetent, as having been interested at the time of attestation; a point on which there has been some difference of opinion, but the greatest authorities are in support of the contrary proposition, namely, that the payment of the legacy would restore the competency of the witness.

2. It was ruled by Lord Holt, in the case of Barlow v. Vowel (5), that if a man be a witness of a wager and afterwards bet himself, this shall not be a reason to except
* 100 *against his being sworn to prove the wager. And from analogy to this case, Lord Kenyon and Mr. Justice Ashurst were of opinion, in the case of Bent v. Baker (1), (where, in an action on a policy of insurance, the broker was called as witness for the defendant, but rejected, because he had underwritten the policy after the defendant,) that, even if it were true in general, that one underwriter could not be a witness for another, yet the witness ought to have been admitted here, as the defendant had acquired an interest in his testimony, before the witness had signed the policy. And they laid down as a general principle, deducible from the case of Barlow v. Vowel, that where a person makes himself a party in interest after a plaintiff or defendant has an interest in his testimony, he may not by this deprive the plaintiff or defendant of his testimony (*a*).

(4) 2 Str. 1253. See *ante*, 3. 27.

(5) Skin. 586. See Rescous v. Williams, 3 Lev. 152.; and Cowp. 736.

(1) 3 T. R. 27.

(*a*) "The interest, in order to exclude the witness, must not have arisen after the fact to which he is called to testify happened, and by his own act, without the interference or consent of the party by whom he is called; because in that case it would be in the power of the witness, and even of the adverse party, to deprive the

However, it appears to be rather doubtful whether this proposition is not expressed in too large and general terms. Whether a witness is incompetent on account of interest must depend rather on the *nature* of the interest than upon the *time of acquiring* it. The question on the *voire dire* is, whether he is interested at *the time of his examination.* If he is directly interested at that time, he is not a competent witness in general without a release, and it seems to be no answer to the objection, to show that he has become interested only since the commencement of the action, or since the time of his being acquainted with the fact which he is called to prove. If, for example, the question is on a customary right of common, a witness will be incompetent, who admits upon the *voire dire* that he is in the occupation of a messuage, and that he claims a similar right of common as annexed to his tenement: and it cannot be material whether he has been in possession for a number of years, or had the tenement only just before the trial of the cause. In either case he appears to be equally incompetent; yet in the latter it may be said, that he acquired his interest, after the party had become interested in his testimony. *So, in the late case of Forester v. Pigou (1), where the defendant in an action on a policy of insurance called another underwriter to prove the policy void on account of a misrepresentation of the nature of the risk, and upon the *voire dire* the witness stated, "that he had paid the loss to the plaintiff upon an understanding that he was to be repaid in the event of this action failing, and that he had since received a letter from the plaintiff promising to re- *101

(1) 1 Maul. & Sel. 9.; 3 Campb. 380, S. C.

---

person wanting his testimony, of the benefit of it." *Jackson d. Woodhull & others* v. *Rumsey*, 3 *Johns. Cas.* 237. But where a person becomes interested by giving bond for a party, and afterwards matters come to his knowledge which would be beneficial to the other party for him to testify, he is not compellable to give this evidence, and thereby expose himself to be subjected on his bond. *Simons* v. *Payne*, 2 *Root* 406.

turn the money in that event," an objection being taken to his competency, the point was argued on the other side upon the authority of Barlow v. Vowel, but the witness was considered to be incompetent and rejected; for although the witness would not be disqualified by any agreement *fraudulently* entered into between him and the plaintiff for the purpose of taking off his testimony, yet on the other hand the pendency of a suit could not prevent third persons from transacting business *bona fide* with one of the parties; and if an interest in the event of the suit is thereby acquired, the general consequence of law must follow, that the person so interested cannot be examined as a witness for that party, from whose success he will necessarily derive an advantage. A motion was afterwards made for a new trial on account of the rejection of this witness, as well as of another also, who was similarly situated; and a new trial was granted for the purpose of ascertaining more particularly the precise time, when the undertaking was made to the witnesses; but the court added, that if a person, who is under no obligation to become a witness for either of the parties to a suit, choose to pay his debt beforehand, upon a condition that is to be determined by the event of the suit, he becomes as much interested in the event, as if he were a party to a consolidation rule. With respect to the case of Barlow v. Vowel, which was much cited in this case of Forester v. Pigou, the Court considered the point as having been there determined on the ground of fraud.—Lord Raymond in the case of the
* 102 *King v. Fox (1) admitted the prosecutor to be a witness, although he had laid a wager, that he should convict the defendant: and the reason seems to be, not because the witness had made the wager at a time when public justice became interested in his testimony, but because it would be against public policy to allow a witness by any such gratuitous act to exclude himself from giving evidence; and there seems to be another reason for admitting the

(1) Str. 652.

witness, since the wager would now probably be considered absolutely void, as tending to produce an improper bias on the mind of the witness, and therefore, as directly prejudicial to the administration of justice.

3. When the witness must be answerable to one or the other of the parties, and the event of the suit determines only to which, he may be examined by either of them without a release. Thus in an action of assumpsit for money paid to the use of the defendants, who were ship-owners, Lord Kenyon admitted the captain to prove, that he had received the money from the plaintiff for the defendant's use; for he stood indifferent between the parties, and he was equally answerable, whichever way the verdict might go (2).

(2) Evans v. Williams, 7 T. R. 481. n. (c), and see ante, p. 53., on this subject.

CHAP. VI.

On the Admissibility of Counsel or Solicitor.

The objections to the competency of a witness, which have been considered in the four preceding chapters, are of a nature to exclude him from giving any kind of evidence. One other objection still remains to be considered; not an objection to his competency, but to particular evidence, which he may be called upon to disclose. This is founded on the professional confidence, which a *client reposes in his counsel, attorney, or solicitor, and which courts of justice ever hold to be inviolable (1). Confidential communications between attorney and client are not to be revealed at any period of time; not in an action between third persons; nor after the proceedings, to which they referred, * 103

(1) Lord Say and Seale's case, 10 Mod. 40. Bull. N. P. 284. Cuts v. Pickering, 1 Ventr. 197.

is at an end; nor after the dismissal of the attorney (2). The privilege of not being examined to such points, as were communicated to the attorney while engaged in his professional capacity, is the privilege of the client, not of the attorney; and it never ceases (*a*). "It is not sufficient to say, the cause is at an end; the mouth of such a person is shut for ever (3)." But this privilege of the client is confined to such communications as are made with reference to professional business during the relation of attorney and client (*b*). A person by profession an attorney, but not employed as attorney in the particular business, which is the subject of inquiry, is not within the rule, although he may have been consulted confidentially (4). If the party waives his privilege, the witness may of course be examined (*c*).

A person who acts as interpreter between an attorney and his client, stands precisely in the same situation as the attorney himself; he is considered as the organ of the attorney, and is under the same conditions of secrecy (5). But it has been ruled at nisi prius, that a person who was consulted confidentially on the supposition of his being an attorney, when in fact he was not one, is compellable to answer (6). And propositions, which the attorney of one party has been professionally intrusted to make to the adverse party, though they are not to be disclosed by the

(2) Wilson v. Rastall, 4 T. R. 759, 760. R. v. Withers, 2 Campb. N. P. C. 578.

(3) Per Buller, J., 4 T. R. 759.

(4) Wilson v. Rastall, 4 T. R. 753. 760.

(5) Du Barre v. Livette, Peake N. P. C. 78. cited by Lord Kenyon in 4 T. R. 756.

(6) Fountain v. Young, 6 Esp. N. P. C. 113.

(*a*) Vide 2 *Mun.* 122, 123. *Sloman* v. *Herne et al.* 1 *Esp.* 695.

(*b*) Vide *Riggs* v. *Denniston*, 3 *Johns. Cas.* 198. *Hoffman and Seton* v. *Smith*, 1 *Caines' Rep.* 157. 1 *M'Nally* 241.

(*c*) An attorney cannot be compelled to produce a paper committed to him by his client, in another cause. *Anonymous*, 8 *Mass. Rep.* 370. *Lynde* v. *Judd*, 3 *Day* 499.

*attorney himself, may yet be proved by another witness, who heard him deliver them (1).

This privilege extends to the three enumerated cases of counsel, solicitor, and attorney; but it is confined to those cases alone. There are indeed cases, said Mr. Justice Buller, in the case of Wilson and Rastall, to which it is much to be lamented that the law of privilege is not extended; those in which medical persons are obliged to disclose the information which they have acquired by attending in their professional characters (2). This point was much considered in the Duchess of Kingston's case, where Sir C. Hawkins, who had attended the duchess as a medical man, was compelled to disclose what had been committed to him in confidence. In a late case at Nisi Prius, where a clerk to the commissioners of the property tax was called to prove the defendant a collector, and refused to give evidence, on the ground of his having taken an oath of office, not to disclose what he should learn as clerk respecting the property tax, except with the consent of the commissioners or by force of an act of parliament, the Court held that this oath would not exempt the witness, and that it must be construed, as containing an implied exception of the evidence, which he might be called to give in courts of justice in obedience to the writ of subpœna (3). In an early case (4), indeed, where the defendant pleaded to an action of debt on bond the statute against buying and selling of offices, and called a witness to show on what occasion the bond was given, Lord Holt is said to have refused his evidence, because it appeared, that he was privately intrusted to make the bargain and to keep it secret. But the principle and authority of this case seem to have been overruled by that of Wilson v. Rastall, and the later decisions on this subject.

(1) Gainsford v. Grammar, 2 Campb. N. P. C. 10.

(2) 4 T. R. 759. See also R. v. Sparkes, cited in Peake's N. P. C. 77. Du Barre v. Livette.

(3) Lee q. t. v. Birrell, 3 Campb. 337.

(4) Bull. N. P. 284.

*The attorney of a party in the cause may be examined like any other witness, where he knew the fact before the retainer, that is, before he was addressed in his professional character (1); or, where he has made himself a party to the transaction (2); or, where he is questioned to a collateral fact within his own knowledge, or to a fact which he might have known without being intrusted as attorney in the cause (3). Thus, if he is a subscribing witness to a deed, he may be examined concerning the execution (4). So, if there be a question about an erasure in a deed or will, he may be asked, whether he had ever seen the instrument in any other state, for it is a fact within his own knowledge; but he ought not to be permitted to disclose any confessions, which his client may have made to him on the subject (5). So, if an attorney were present when his client was sworn to an answer in chancery, he might be a witness on an indictment for perjury, to prove the fact of taking the oath, which is a fact not peculiarly within his knowledge as an attorney, and not committed to him in secrecy (6). So, the attorney of one of the parties may be examined as to the contents of a written notice, which had been received by him in the course of the cause calling upon him to produce papers (7).

On the same principle, in an action of debt upon a bond, the plaintiff's attorney was admitted by Lord Kenyon to prove, that the bond had been given on an usurious consideration (8). And, where a person, (who had brought an action on a promissory note, which was afterwards compromised by the defendant,) had informed the attorney

(1) Cuts v. Pickering, 1 Ventr. 197. Lord Say and Seale's case, 10 Mod. 40.; Bull. N. P. 284. S. C. 4 T. R. 759.

(2) Duffin v. Smith, Peake N. P. C. 108. Robson v. Kemp. 5 Esp. N. P. C. 52. Cowp. 845.

(3) Bull. N. P. 284. Per Lord Mansfield, C. J. in Duchess of Kingston's case, 11 State Tr. 253.

(4) Doe d. Jupp v. Andrews, Cowp. 846. Robson v. Kemp, 4 Esp. N. P. C. 235.; 5 Esp. N. P. C. 53. S. C.

(5) Bull. N. P. 284. 1 Ventr. 197.

(6) Bull. N. P. 284. Per Lord Mansfield, C. J. in Cowp. 846. R. v. Watkinson, 2 St. 1122, *contra;* but the reporter makes a *quære.*

(7) Spenceley v. Schullenberg, 7 East 357.

(8) Duffin v. Smith, Peake N. P. C. 108.

after the compromise, that there never had been any consideration *for the note, the Court of King's Bench held, that the attorney was compellable to disclose that circumstance, in an action brought to recover back the money (1). The communication, said Lord Kenyon, was not here made in contemplation of a suit. On the contrary, the purpose in view had been already obtained; and what was said by the client was from exultation, in having before deceived his attorney as well as his adversary (*a*). * 106

(1) Cobden v. Kendrick, 4 T. R. 432.

CHAP. VII.

Of certain general Rules of Evidence.

If no objection is made to the competency of a witness, and he is allowed to give evidence, the next question is, what evidence ought to be given; and in what manner is

(*a*) An attorney may be examined whether a note put into his hands to collect was indorsed or not. *Baker* v. *Arnold*, 1 *Caines' Rep.* 258.

The privilege of secrecy is so strictly confined to the cases of attorney, solicitor, or counsel, that not only physicians are admissible to disclose the knowledge which they have acquired in their professional characters, as stated in the text, but a priest of the Romish church cannot refuse to answer questions respecting facts which came to his knowledge in a confidential communication, on the ground that it was made to him in the exercise of his clerical functions, and that the principles of his religion forbade him to disclose it. *Butler* v. *Moore*, 1 *M'Nally* 253. A prisoner being a papist, had made a confession before a protestant clergyman, of the crime for which he was indicted, and that confession was permitted to be given in evidence on the trial, and he was convicted and executed. *Rex* v. *Sparkes*, cited *Peake's Cas.* 77.

If one who is sitting as judge or juryman, happen to know a fact with which the other judges or jurors are unacquainted, he is sworn

the witness to be examined. It will, therefore, now be necessary to inquire into certain general rules, which have been established, for the purpose of directing the testimony of witnesses, and for the more effectual attainment of the ends of justice. The consideration of these rules will form the subject of the present chapter; and in the next chapter some inquiry will be made into the mode of examining witnesses.

The order in which it is proposed to consider the subject, is the following:

First, As to the number of witnesses to the proof of a fact;

Secondly, Of the nature of presumptive evidence;

Thirdly, That evidence is to be confined to the points in issue;

*107 *Fourthly, That the affirmative of the issue is to be proved;

Fifthly, That the substance only of the issue need be proved;

Sixthly, That the best evidence is to be given, which the nature of the case admits;

Lastly, That hearsay evidence is not admissible.

Sect. I.

As to the Number of Witnesses for the Proof of a Fact.

The general rule at common law is, that a single witness, if credible, is sufficient for the proof of any fact; in which respect the law of England differs from the civil law, where one of the maxims is, "unius responsio non "omnino audiatur." Lord Coke, indeed, has said in his

---

and openly examined as to the fact, the same as any other witness, and is equally liable to cross-examination. *Peake Ev.* 10. n. 2 *Hawk. P. C.* c. 46. § 17.

Commentary (1), that "when a trial is by witnesses, as in the case of the challenge of a juror or summons of a tenant, the affirmation ought to be proved by two or more witnesses, but where the trial is by verdict, there the judgment is not given upon witnesses, but upon the verdict, and upon such evidence as is given to the jury they find their verdict." But this distinction has been denied by Lord Holt (2), and the doctrine is said not to be warranted by the authorities cited in its support. By our law, however, the testimony of a single witness will not be sufficient in a few particular cases.

In case of perjury.

First, On an indictment for perjury, the evidence of one witness is not sufficient to convict the defendant; because then there would only be one oath against another. "To convict a man of perjury," said C. J. Parker, *in the case of the Queen v. Muscot (1), "there must be strong and clear evidence, and more numerous than the evidence given for the defendant." It does not appear to have been laid down, that *two witnesses* are necessary to disprove the fact sworn to by the defendant; nor does that appear to be absolutely requisite. But, at least, one witness is not sufficient; and, in addition to his testimony, some other independent evidence ought to be adduced.

* 108

In case of treason.

Secondly, It was enacted, for the security of the subject, by stat. 1 Ed. 6. c. 12. § 22., that "No person shall be indicted, arraigned, condemned, or convicted for any offence of treason, petit treason, misprision of treason, unless the offender be accused by two sufficient and lawful witnesses, or willingly, without violence, confess the same (*a*)." By the common law one witness would have been sufficient on the trial of those offences (*b*); and this

(1) Co. Lit. 6. *b*.
(2) Shotter v. Friend, Carth. 144.

(1) 10 Mod. 193.

(*a*) Vide ante, 84. n. (*b*)

(*b*) Acc. 1 *M'Nally* 31. The statutes of Edw. 6. not having been enacted in Ireland, one witness was held sufficient to convict for high treason.

is the first act of the legislature, where two witnesses are required. A similar provision is contained in the stat. 5, 6 Ed. 6. c. 11. § 12., which enacts, that "No person shall be indicted, arraigned, condemned, convicted, or attainted for any of the treasons or offences in that act mentioned, or for any treasons which then were or hereafter might be, unless the offender should be accused by two lawful accusers, who at the time of the arraignment should be brought, &c., unless the party arraigned should willingly, without violence, confess the same." So that two witnesses would at that time have been necessary in treasons relating to the coin of the kingdom. But an alteration in this respect was made by the stat. 1, 2 Ph. & Mary, c. 10. § 12., and 1, 2 Ph. & Mary, c. 11. § 3., which provided, that "in all cases of high treason concerning the current coin, or for counterfeiting the king's signet, privy seal, and great seal, or sign manual, and on trials for bringing counterfeit coin into the realm, or for any offence concerning the impairing, counterfeiting, or forging the cur-
* 109 *rent coin, the prisoners should be tried by the same evidence, as they were before the reign of Edward the Sixth (1)." In these cases, therefore, a single witness will now be sufficient; and it has been agreed by all the judges, that these statutes extend to all offences, touching the impairing of the coin, which should afterwards be made treason (2). The stat. 7. 8 W. 3. c. 3., which relates only to such treasons as induce corruption of blood, enacts in the second section, that "No person shall be tried or attainted of that species of high treason, or of misprision of such treason, but by the oaths and testimony of two lawful witnesses, either both of them to the same overt act, or one of them to one, and the other of them to another overt act of the *same* treason; unless the party indicted and tried shall willingly, without violence, in open court confess the same, or shall stand mute, or refuse to plead, or in cases

(1) The like provision in statute 8, 9 W. 3. c. 26. s. 7. and stat. 6 G. 3. c. 53. s. 3.

(2) Gahagan's case, 1 Leach Cr. C. 50. 1 East P. C. 129. S. C.

of high treason shall peremptorily challenge above the number of thirty-five of the jury." And by the 4th section it is enacted, "If two or more *distinct* treasons of *divers kinds* are alleged in one indictment, one witness produced to prove one of the said treasons, and another witness to prove another of the said treasons, shall not be deemed to be two witnesses to the same treason within the meaning of this act." The stat. 39, 40 G. 3. c. 93. enacts, that "in all cases of high treason, when the overt act alleged in the indictment is the assassination of the king or any direct attempt against his life, or against his person, the prisoner shall be tried according to the same order of trial and upon the like evidence, as if he stood charged with murder." A conviction, therefore, in such a case may proceed on the testimony of a single witness.

The language of the statutes of Edward 6. is, that "the offenders are to be accused by two witnesses," that is, two *witnesses are required to prove the offence or overt act of treason; and the stat. of W. 3. expressly confines itself to the proof of the overt acts. With respect to all other acts, therefore, which are merely collateral, the rule of common law is not altered, and one witness is still sufficient (1). * 110

Thirdly, it is an established principle in courts of equity, that, on a bill praying relief, when the facts charged by the plaintiff, as the ground for obtaining a decree, are proved only by a single witness, and are *clearly* and *positively* denied by the answer of the defendant; the court will not grant a decree against the defendant (2) (*a*). But where the evidence produced by the plaintiff is so far supported and corroborated by proof of concurring circumstances, as In courts of equity.

(1) Smith's case, Fost. 242.
(2) L'Neve v. L'Neve, 1 Ves. 64. 125. 2 Ves. jun. 243. East Ind. Comp. v. Donald, 9 Ves. 282, 3. 66. 3 Atk. 646. S. C. 1 Ves. 97.

(*a*) Vide *Clason* v. *Morris & Mowatt*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 524. *Beatty* v. *Smith & Thompson*, 2 *Hen. & Mun.* 395. *Heffner* v. *Miller & others*, 2 *Mun.* 43. *Salter* v. *Speir*, *Tayl.* 318.

to outweigh the denial in the defendant's answer (3), (abstracting from the mind, that the evidence on the part of the plaintiff comes from a *disinterested* witness (4),) the former rule will not apply; and the evidence of a single witness, so strengthened and confirmed, will enable the court to decree against the answer. And there are many cases, in which the court has granted a decree against the defendant on the testimony of a single witness, when his testimony has not been clearly and positively contradicted by the answer (5).

In ecclesiastical courts.

By the civil law, as was before observed, two witnesses are required for the proof of a fact; and such is the rule in ecclesiastical courts, whose practice is founded upon that law. But even in those courts, if a matter cognizable at common law arises incidentally in an ecclesiastical suit, (as, where a revocation of a will is pleaded, or payment of a *legacy, or plene administravit, and the like,) the proof ought to be according to the principles and course of the common law; and if they disallow the plea, because it is proved only by a single witness, they may be controlled by a prohibition (1).

* 111

Sect. II.

Of the Nature of Presumptive Evidence.

Presumptive evidence.

Evidence consists either of positive or of presumptive proof. The proof is positive, when a witness speaks directly to a fact from his own immediate knowledge; and presumptive, when the fact itself is not proved by direct

(3) Walton v. Hobbs, 2 Atk. 19. Jansón v. Rany, ib. 140. Pember v. Mathers, 1 Bro. Ch. C. 52. Toole v. Medlicott, 1 Ball & Beatty 403. Biddulph v. St. John, 2 Sch. & Lef. 521.

(4) 9 Ves. 283.

(5) 3 Atk. 650. 1 Ves. 66. 97. 12 Ves. 80.

(1) Sir W. Juxon v. Lord Byron, 2 Lev. 64. Richardson v. Disborow, 1 Ventr. 291. Shotter v. Friend, Carth. 142. 1 Ld. Ray. 221. Cowp. 424. Com. Dig. tit. Prohibition, (F. 13.) and (G. 23.)

testimony, but is to be inferred from circumstances, which either necessarily or usually attend such facts (2). It is obvious therefore, that a presumption is more or less likely to be true, according as it is more or less probable, that the circumstances would not have existed, unless the fact, which is inferred from them, had also existed; and that a presumption can only be relied on, until the contrary is actually proved. In order to raise a presumption, it cannot be necessary to confine the evidence to such circumstances alone, as could not have happened, unless they had been also attended by the alleged fact,—for that in effect would be to require in all cases evidence amounting to positive proof;—but it will be sufficient to prove those circumstances, which *usually* attend the fact. If the circumstantial evidence be such, as may afford a fair and reasonable presumption of the facts to be tried, it is to be received and left to the consideration of the jury, to whom alone it belongs to determine upon the precise force and effect of the circumstances proved, and whether they are sufficiently satisfactory and convincing to warrant them in finding the fact in issue (3). *However, for the purpose of * 112
trying the weight and effect of such presumptive proofs, it will often be of the utmost consequence to consider, whether any *other* fact happened, which might have been attended by the same circumstances, and with which of the facts they are most consistent.

It has been very justly observed (1), that when the proofs are dependent on each other, or when all the proofs are dependent upon one, the number of proofs neither increase nor diminish the probability of the fact; for the force of the whole is not greater than the force of that, on which they depend; and if this fails, they all fall to the ground. But when the proofs are distinct and independent of each other, the probability of the fact increases in proportion to the number of the proofs; for the falsehood of one does not diminish the veracity of another.

(2) Gilb. Ev. 142.
(3) 2 H. Bl. 297.

(1) Beccaria, ch. xiv.

Pr. Ev. of legitimacy.

The fact of the birth of a child during a lawful marriage is prima facie evidence of its legitimacy. Formerly the rule was so strict, that children were presumed to be legitimate, unless the husband had been out of the kingdom during the whole time of gestation; but this doctrine has been long exploded. The general principle, to be deduced from the authorities on this subject, as it was laid down and confirmed by the case of the King v. Luffe (2), appears to be this, that where there are circumstances, which show an impossibility that the husband could be the father, whether arising from his being under the age of puberty, or from his labouring under disability occasioned by natural infirmity, or from the length of time elapsed since his death, or from his continued absence, the presumption is at an end, and the child will be deemed illegitimate (*a*). In an earlier case (3), the court of King's Bench held, that there was no necessity to prove the *impossibility*, if the other circumstances of the case tended strongly to repel the presump-
*113 *tion of access. And this point has been since established by the opinion of the Judges in the case of the Banbury claim of peerage (1), in which it was held, that, where the husband and wife are not proved to be impotent, and have had opportunity of access to each other during the period, in which a child could be begotten and born in the course of nature, the presumption of legitimacy arising from the birth of the child during wedlock may be rebutted by circumstances inducing a contrary presumption: and the fact of non-access, (that is, the non-existence of sexual intercourse,) as well as the fact of impotency, may always be lawfully proved by means of such legal evidence, as is strictly admissible in every other case, where a physical fact is to be proved. It has been held, that, in the case of

(2) 8 East 193. 206.
(3) Goodright dem. Thompson, v. Saul, 4 T. R. 356.
(1) 2 Selw. N. P. 681. MS.

(*a*) See this subject discussed in the case of *The Commonwealth* v. *Shepherd*, 6 *Binney* 283.

a divorce *a mensa et thoro*, a child born after such a separation is presumed to be illegitimate (2); in this case, therefore, the party who asserts the child's legitimacy, will have to prove access (*a*).

Of payment.

A receipt for rent due on a certain day is strong presumptive evidence, that the former rents have been regularly paid down to that time. But it is only presumptive evidence; and the other party will be allowed to prove the contrary. "If a man gives a receipt for the last rent, says Ch. B. Gilbert (3), the former is presumed to be paid, because he is supposed first to receive and take in the debts of the longest standing; especially if the receipt be in full of all demands, then it is plain there were no debts standing out; and if this be under hand and seal, the presumption is so strong, that the law admits of no proof to the contrary." So, in an action for work and labour done for the defendant, proof that the plaintiff and other workmen, who were employed by the defendant, came regularly to receive their wages from the defendant, whose practice was to pay every week, and that the plaintiff had not been heard to complain *of non-payment, would be presumptive evidence of payment to meet a stale demand (1) (*b*). * 114

(2) Parishes of St. George v. St. Margaret, 1 Salk. 123.
(3) Gilb. Ev. 142.

(1) Lucas v. Novosilienski, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 296.

(*a*) Marriage may, in most instances, be presumed from cohabitation, reception by the party's family as man and wife, and other circumstances. *Harvey* v. *Harvey*, 2 *Black. Rep.* 877. *Read* v. *Passer*, 1 *Esp. Rep.* 213. S. C. *Peake's Cas.* 231. *Fenton* v. *Reed*, 4 *Johns. Rep.* 52. *Newburyport* v. *Boothbay*, 9 *Mass. Rep.* 414. *Telts et ux.* v. *Foster & Williams*, *Tayl.* 121. *Purcell* v. *Purcell*, 4 *Hen. & Mun.* 507. But in actions of *crim. con.* and prosecutions for polygamy, an actual marriage must be proved. 4 *Burr.* 2057. 7 *Johns. Rep.* 314. ante, 74. *n.*

(*b*) An order to pay money is, in the hands of the drawee, evidence of payment, otherwise of an order to deliver goods. *Blount* v. *Starkey's Admrs. Tayl.* 110.

So, in the case of a bond, which has been suffered to lie dormant for 20 years, payment may be presumed (*a*). Forbearance for so long a time unexplained is a circumstance, from which the jury may and ought to infer, that the bond has been satisfied (2). It has been sometimes said, that payment may be presumed even within that time (3); but this is to be understood with reference only to those cases, where there has been some other evidence to raise such a presumption, as, the settling of an account in the intermediate time, without noticing any demand upon the bond (4). However, the presumption arising after such a lapse of time may be repelled by proof of the defendant's recent admission of the debt; or by proof of the payment of interest within 20 years, which is an acknowledgment that the principal sum was not then discharged (5); or the presumption may be answered by proof of other circumstances, explaining satisfactorily why an earlier demand has not been made (*b*).

(2) 6 Mod. 22. 4 Burr. 1963. Oswald v. Legh, 1 T. R. 270.
(3) 1 Burr. 434. Cowp. 109.
(4) 1 T. R. 271, 2. 4 Burr. 1963. Colsel v. Budd, 1 Campb. N.P.C. 27.
(5) 1 T. R. 270.

(*a*) Vide *Executors of Brewton* v. *Executors of Cannon*, 1 *Bay* 482. After a lapse of 18 years the court would not permit judgment to be entered up on a bond and warrant of attorney, on an affidavit stating that the bond was duly executed and still remained due; that the obligor was living, and that the reason why the judgment was not entered up before was the insolvency of the obligor: the obligee should have shown a demand of payment, and an acknowledgment of the debt within the 18 years. *Executors of Clark* v. *Hopkins*, 7 *Johns. Rep.* 556.

(*b*) Vide *Cottle* v. *Payne*, 3 *Day* 289. This period of twenty years must be exclusive of time during which the plaintiff was under a disability to sue. *Dunlop* v. *Bell*, 2 *Cranch* 180. And must be exclusive of the period of tumult and confusion like the revolutionary war. 10 *Johns. Rep.* 417. *Brewton's Executors* v. *Cannon's Executors*, 1 *Bay* 483. Where the plaintiff to rebut the presumption, proved that he had instituted a suit against a person as executor of the obligor, who pleaded that he never was executor, but had renounced the office, whereupon the suit was discontinued,

With respect to the *proof* of the payment of interest, it may be proved by showing an indorsement to that effect in the hand-writing of the obligor, or made by his direction; or, by an indorsement in the hand-writing of the obligee, provided it appears by extrinsic evidence, that the indorsement was made within 20 years after the money was payable, that is, at a time when it was against the interest of the obligee to make such a written acknowledgment, unless the fact were true. This point respecting an indorsement by the *obligee*, was determined in the case of Searle v. Lord *Barrington (1), in an action by the administrator of an obligee against the administrator of the obligor. The defendant pleaded *solvit ad diem*, and insisted on the length of time as presumptive evidence, that the money had been paid; in answer to this, the plaintiff offered in evidence an indorsement in the hand-writing of the obligee, who died about 13 years after the date of the bond, this indorsement stating that interest had been paid 10 years after the date; and after much argument it was at length determined on a writ of error, that the evidence was admissible. It is not very easy to perceive the principle upon which this decision was founded. No reason is given for the admissibility of the evidence in Lord Raymond's report. According to the report in Strange, the

* 115

(1) 2 Stra. 826.; 2 Ld. Ray. 1370. S. C. Pratt, C. J. rejected the evidence on the trial; but the other Judges of K. B. held it to be admissible. On a second trial, many years after, Lord Raymond, C. J. received the evidence; on which a bill of exceptions was tendered and signed. On writ of error in the Exchequer-chamber, five Judges thought it admissible, and two Judges were of the contrary opinion. This judgment was afterwards affirmed in the House of Lords.

---

it was held that the demand was insufficient to destroy the presumption, having been made of a person wholly unconnected in the transaction; and the court say, that a writ sued out against the party really liable, though he should not be arrested upon it, if the transaction were bona fide, would go a great length in defeating the presumption; so would an imperfect writ, if the proper party were arrested upon it. *Quince's Administrators* v. *Ross's Administrators*, *Tayl.* 155.

three Judges of the court of King's Bench, who differed in opinion from the Chief Justice on the first trial, held that the indorsement ought to have been left to the jury, "because the jury might have reason to believe, that it "was done with *the privity of the obligor*, and the constant "practice is for the obligee to indorse the payment of in-"terest; and that for the sake of the obligor, who is safer "by such an indorsement, than by taking a loose receipt." It appears indeed to be certain, that if extrinsic evidence had been produced, showing the indorsement to have been made with *the privity of the obligor*, such evidence would have made it clearly admissible as in effect the *obligor*'s indorsement; but perhaps it may deserve consideration, whether such extrinsic evidence was not previously necessary, before the indorsement could be received in evidence; for the objection against receiving the indorsement of the obligee, which the Chief Justice on the first trial thought decisive, was this, that the indorsement being in the
* 116 hand-writing of the obligee, who *had the bond in his custody, and might enter what he pleased upon it, could not be evidence for him nor for his administrator, though it would have been good evidence against him. The general principle certainly is, that a person cannot make evidence for himself; what he says or writes for himself cannot be evidence in support of his right, and consequently cannot be evidence for his representative claiming in his right or place; what a party has said or done may be evidence *against* himself, but it can only be admitted to restrain, not to advance his interest (1). And although there are a variety of cases, in which written entries by deceased persons against their interest have been admitted as evidence of the fact there stated, (as will appear afterwards in treating of the subject of hearsay,) it is to be observed that in those cases the entries were given in evidence, not in favour of the persons who had made them, nor for the representatives, but were produced on the part of third per-

(1) 2 Ves. 42, 3. 5 T. R. 123.

sons, who had no concern whatever in making them. Lord Chancellor Hardwicke in one of his judgments has made some observations on this case of Searle v. Lord Barrington (2); he laid down the general principle as above stated, and then added, "As to the case of indorsements by "an obligee of the payment of interest, it does not at all "prove the original right to the thing in demand. In-"dorsements by an obligee of the payment of interest on "a bond are evidence *against* that obligee originally in the "nature of the thing; and the other is only consequential "evidence to take it out of the presumption arising from "length of time, which he ought to have the benefit of on "the other hand; and in that case, I take it, the indorse-"ments were made and bore date within the twenty years; "for if those indorsements were dated after the expiration "of twenty years, though they were evidence of the actual "payment of interest after that time, they would not be "evidence to take it out of that *presumption (1)." Upon the whole, then, the case of Searle v. Lord Barrington, must be considered as an exception to the general principle of evidence, and as having been decided on its own peculiar circumstances; and though on the authority of that case, which underwent so much revision, an indorsement by the *obligee* should be considered admissible in evidence, there ought certainly to be some extrinsic evidence to prove that the indorsement was made within the 20 years. Such evidence was produced in that case; it being there proved, that the obligee, who made the indorsement, died about 13 years after the date of the bond. It will not be sufficient, that the indorsement bears date on a certain day, and purports to have been then made. That of itself proves absolutely nothing. The danger is, that the obligee may be induced to manufacture evidence for himself, for the purpose of encountering the presumption, which might be formed against him after his forbearance

* 117

(2) Glynn v. Bank of England, 2 Ves. 43.

(1) This point was so ruled by Lord Raymond in Turner v. Crisp, 2 Str. 827.

for such a length of time. Such an indorsement therefore ought to be proved by extrinsic evidence to have been written at a time, when its effect was clearly in contradiction to the writer's interest (2). Further, it should seem, if the defendant produces evidence of the payment of the principal sum and interest, the plaintiff cannot be allowed to encounter that evidence by an indorsement in his own hand-writing, purporting that interest was paid on a subsequent day;—for supposing the fact to be true, that the bond has been satisfied by payment, it would obviously be his interest to make such an indorsement, which he might afterwards use as evidence in an action upon the bond.

Although it may be presumed that a bond has been satisfied after a forbearance for 20 years unexplained on the part of the obligee, yet it has been held, that, in the case of a quit-rent claimed by the lord of a manor, proof by the tenant, that no demand had been made upon him for near
* 118 *40 years, was not a sufficient ground for presuming a release or extinguishment; and that no such presumption could be raised within less than 50 years, which is the period fixed by the statute of limitations (1). A bond may be discharged by payment, and on account of the difficulty of proving this fact after a length of time, it is reasonable to presume it without positive proof: but for the extinguishment of a quit-rent a deed is necessary, and it would be too much to presume, that the lord of the manor has executed such a deed, from the mere fact of his not having demanded payment of the quit-rent. "A presumption," said Mr. Justice Aston, "from mere length of time, which is to support a right, is very different from a presumption to defeat a right; here the presumption is to defeat the right of the lord to a small payment within the 50 years limited by the statute; and therefore upon a mere length

(2) See Rose v. Bryant, 2 Campb. 321.; and Hoare and another v. Coryton, 4 Taunt. 560.

(1) Eldridge v. Knott, Cowp. 214.

of time unaccompanied by other circumstances, such a limitation ought not to be altered, and another set up (*a*)."

Possession is prima facie evidence of property. Possession with an assertion of property, or even possession alone, gives the possessor such a property as will enable him to maintain an action of trover or trespass against a wrongdoer (2). Thus it has been held, that an agister of cattle may maintain trespass against a person for wrongfully taking them away (3) (*b*). And the principle applies to criminal as well as civil cases. On a prosecution for larceny, the property of the goods may be laid in the person who had possession at the time; and proof of the mere possession will support the indictment. This has been determined in the case of an agister of cattle (4), and in the case of a coachman, who drove the stage-coach by which the goods were sent (5). So, (to give another example in a civil case,) in an action on a policy of insurance (6), the mere *fact of possession of a ship by the plaintiff as owner * 119

Of property.

(2) Armory v. Delamirie, 1 Str. 505. Graham v. Peate, 1 East 244. Sutton v. Buck, 2 Taunt. 302.

(3) 2 Roll. Abr. tit. Trespass, (M.)

(4) Woodward's case, 2 East P. C. 653.

(5) Deakin's case, 2 East P. C. 653.

(6) Robertson v. French, 4 East 130.

(*a*) After a lapse of 20 years, a mortgage will be presumed satisfied, where the mortgagor has been in possession, no interest has been paid, or steps taken to enforce the mortgage. 1 *Treat. of Equity* 332. *n.* 12 *Vez.* 266. *Higginson* v. *Mein*, 4 *Cranch* 415. *Jackson d. The People* v. *Wood*, 12 *Johns. Rep.* 242. *Jackson d. The People* v. *Pierce*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 414. The period is not strictly confined to 20 years, but the presumption has been allowed after a lapse of 19 years. *Jackson d. Martin & others* v. *Pratt*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 381. In like manner the same period of 20 years is prima facie a bar to an equity of redemption. 1 *Pow. on Mortgages* 408. 1 *Treat. of Eq.* 332. *n.* 2 *Treat. of Eq.* 263. 1 *Wash.* 18.

(*b*) So, an officer who has taken goods under an execution, may bring trespass or trover, against a person who takes them away. *Barker & Knapp* v. *Miller*, 6 *Johns. Rep.* 195.

is sufficient prima facie evidence of ownership; and though it should appear on the cross-examination of one of the witnesses for the plaintiff, that the plaintiff derived his ownership under a bill of sale executed by the witness himself, it would not on that account become necessary for the plaintiff to produce that bill of sale. The proof of possession will be sufficient without the aid of any documentary proof, unless such further evidence is rendered necessary in consequence of some contrary proof on the other side.

Of grants, &c.

There are many cases, not within the statute of limitations, where courts of justice, from a principle of quieting possession, have held, that juries ought to presume the most solemn instruments to support a length of possession (*a*). The rule of presumption is applied, wherever the possession of the party is rightful, to invest that possession with a legal title (1). Even in case of the crown, which is not bound by the statutes of limitation, a charter or grant may be presumed from great length of possession (2) (*b*).

(1) 8 East 263. 102. 3 T. R. 151. 8. 7 T. R. 492.
(2) Bedle v. Beard, 12 Rep. 5. 11 East 488.
Mayor of Kingston v. Horner, Cowp.

(*a*) It has been said, says Ld. Chan. Erskine, you cannot presume unless you believe. It is because there are no means of creating belief or disbelief, that such general presumptions are raised, upon subjects, of which there is no record or written muniment. Therefore upon the weakness and infirmity of all human tribunals, judging of matters of antiquity, instead of belief, which must be the foundation of the judgment upon a recent transaction, where the circumstances are incapable of forming any thing like belief, the legal presumption holds the place of particular and individual belief. Mankind, from the infirmity and necessity of their situation, must, for the preservation of their property and rights, have recourse to some general principle, to take the place of individual and specific belief; which can hold only as to matters within our own time; upon which a conclusion can be formed from particular and individual knowledge. 12 *Vez.* 266, 267.

(*b*) So, a patent or grant of land from the state, which is matter of record, has been presumed, after a length of possession. *Arch-*

An endowment of a vicarage may be presumed from the long and continued possession of first fruits and tenths (3). So, long and uninterrupted usage will support a modus decimandi. It is evidence from which the jury may presume an agreement, beyond time of memory, between the land-owners and all the parties, whose consent was necessary to give it effect. But such usage will not of itself be sufficient to support a modus *de non decimando.* And though immemorial custom is evidence of the other kind of modus, and is in general a ground for presuming deeds even against the crown; yet in the particular instance of a composition for tithes, it is settled, that where the deed cannot be produced, some evidence must be given referring to the *deed, or showing that it did exist, independent of mere * 120
usage. And the reason why this has been so held is stated to be, that if it were otherwise, the church would be defrauded, and every bad modus turned into a good composition. "The presumption of a deed from long usage is for the furtherance of justice and for the sake of peace, when there has been a long exercise of an adverse right. For instance, it cannot be supposed, that any man would suffer his neighbour to obstruct the light of his windows and render his house uncomfortable, or to use a way with carts and carriages over his meadow for 20 years successively, unless some agreement had been made between the parties to that effect, of which the usage, is evidence. But with respect to a composition for tithes, the same reason does not obtain, because temporary agreements are made and continued for the convenience of parties during a suc-

(3) Crimes v. Smyth, 12 Rep. 4. 2 Gwill. 514. 716. 732.

---

er v. *Sadler*, 2 *Hen. & Mun.* 370. *Den d. Hanks* v. *Tucker*, *Tayl.* 157. In an action of ejectment, in which the plaintiff claimed under a grant under the great seal of the state, a prior grant to the defendant was presumed from uninterrupted length of possession. *Lessee of Alston* v. *Saunders*, 1 *Bay*, 26. A recovery, which is a conveyance of record, may be presumed. *Hasselden* v. *Bradney* 2 *Term Rep.* 159.

cession of incumbents: there is no exercise of any adverse right, which is generally deemed necessary to raise the presumption (1)."

Upon the same principle, uninterrupted enjoyment of an easement for 20 years, or upwards, is strong evidence of a right of enjoyment, from which juries are directed by the court to presume a conveyance or agreement; as, in an action on the case for obstructing the plaintiff's lights (2), or in the case of a market regularly kept above 20 years (3). So, a faculty from the ordinary may be presumed from the long uninterrupted usage of a pew in a church, claimed as appurtenant to a messuage (4). So, an adverse enjoyment of a way over another person's land for above 20 years is a strong ground for the jury to presume a grant, although about 26 years ago the way was extinguished by an award under
* 121 *an enclosure act (1). If indeed the party had asserted his right to be grounded on the award, this would show that the way was used by mistake; but unless it could be clearly referred to something else besides adverse possession, the jury would probably be directed not to consider small circumstances as raising a presumption, that the possession arose otherwise than by grant (*a*).

(1) Knight v. Halsey, in error, 2 Bos. & Pull. 206. The first case on this subject seems to have been in 1778, Haywood v. Nichols, 3 Gwill. 1120. The cases are collected in Bennet v. Neale, 1 Wightw. 324. in Mr. Baron Wood's argument.

(2) Lewis v. Price, reported in Mr. Serjt. Williams's edition of Saund. 2 vol. 175. *a.*; Dongal v. Wilson, id. 175. *b.*; Darwin v. Upton, id. 3 T. R. 159.

(3) Holcroft v. Heel, 1 Bos. & Pull. 401.

(4) Rogers v. Brooks, 1 T. R. 431. (*a*). Griffiths v. Matthews, 5 T. R. 296. 8.

(1) Campbell v. Wilson, 3 East 294. 302. Keymer v. Summers, Bull. N. P. 74. Carr v. Heaton, 3 Gwill. 1262. As to a public right of way, by a presumed dereliction on the part of the owner of the soil, see the case of the Trustees of the Rugby Charity v. Merryweather, 11 East 375. n. R. v. Lloyd, 1 Campb. N. P. C. 260.

(*a*) Twenty years occupation of a way or other easement is a sufficient bar to an action of trespass. But the twenty years are to be reckoned from the date of the supposed trespass, and not from the commencement of the action brought for it. *Strout & another* v. *Berry*, 7 *Mass. Rep.* 385.

Adverse possession for a shorter period than 20 years will not of itself afford a ground for such a presumption; and there ought to be some other evidence in support of the right (2). However, a license may be presumed within that time, though in general a grant cannot; as, in an action of ejectment to recover part of a waste enclosed by the defendant, where it was proved that the steward of the lord of the manor had from time to time seen the enclosure, which had been nearly 13 years, without making any objection, this was held to be evidence from which the jury might presume a license from the lord (3).

In the cases which have been mentioned, the usage for 20 years was considered to be strong presumptive evidence of a grant or agreement. But it is only *presumptive* proof; and therefore evidence is admissible to repel such a presumption; as, by showing that the usage was limited, or modified, or bad in its commencement, or that it clearly originated in a mistake (4). In the case of Darwin v. Upton (5), which has been cited, where the effect of this kind of evidence was much considered, Lord Mansfield said, "The enjoyment of lights with the defendant's acquiescence for 20 years is such decisive presumption of a right by grant or otherwise, that, unless contradicted or ex-
*plained, the jury ought to believe it. But it is impossible * 122
that length of time can be said to be an *absolute bar* like a statute of limitation; it is certainly a *presumptive bar*, which ought to go to the jury." The other Judges also were strongly of the same opinion. In the case of Holcroft v. Heel, indeed (1), Ch. J. Eyre who tried the cause held that an undisturbed possession of a market by the defendant for 23 years was a *bar* to an action brought by the plaintiff the grantee of a neighbouring market, and therefore nonsuited the plaintiff; and the Court of Common Pleas seem, from the report, to have been of the same

(2) 6 East 215. 4 Burr. 1963. Cotterel v. Griffiths, 4 Esp. N. P. C. 69.

(3) Doe dem. Foley v. Wilson, 11 East 56.

(4) 3 East 300. 2.

(5) 2 Saund. 175. *c.*

(1) 1 Bos. & Pull. 400.

opinion. But this case has been since explained by a learned Judge who was counsel in the cause (2); and it appears to have been the opinion of the Court, that the adverse possession was such strong evidence, that the Chief Justice ought to have *left it to the jury* to find a grant of the market from the crown; but as the court also intimated, that if the cause were to be tried again upon the same facts, the jury would be so directed, the plaintiff's counsel declined pressing for a new trial. So that this case appears not to be inconsistent with the other authorities, which determine, that such a continued possession is only *presumptive* evidence of a grant.

The usage, which is supposed to be founded on a grant or agreement, determines also the extent of the supposed grant (3). The right granted is considered to be commensurate with the right enjoyed. A person who has enjoyed a limited right cannot lawfully enlarge it to the detriment of others; and, in case of such enlargement, those who are prejudiced may lawfully obstruct the use in the *newly acquired* part; but still he will be entitled to the enjoyment of his *former* right, not only to the same extent, but in the same specific manner (4) (*a*). So, if a person has a way for carriages from D. to B. over another man's close, and pur-
*123 *chases land adjoining to B., he cannot use the way with carriages to the adjoining land, though he comes first to B. and so to the adjoining land; for this way may be prejudicial to the other person's close (1). The continued use

(2) 3 East 298. 302.
(3) 14 East 339, 340.
(4) Chandler v. Thompson, 3 Campb. 80. And see Martin v. Globe, 1 Campb. 320. Bealey v. Shaw, 6 East 208.
(1) Roll. Ab. 391. tit. Chimin, Art. 3. Laughton v. Ward, 1 Lutw. 111.

(*a*) Where A. had a fulling-mill on the same stream with and above B.'s grist-mill, and A.'s mill had been erected and in operation for more than 20 years after B.'s mill was built, it was held that A.'s uninterrupted enjoyment of the stream above, for that length of time, had given him such a right to the water, that B. could not raise his dam, and thereby throw back the water upon the wheel of A.'s mill. *Sherwood* v. *Burr*, 4 *Day* 244.

and enjoyment of a private way for carriages does not *necessarily* imply a right to use it as a drift-way, though the one has been often understood as including the other (2). However, it has been held that the use of a carriage-way is evidence of a right of way for all kinds of cattle, more especially, if some species of cattle have been usually driven along the way; and that it will be a question for the jury to determine, from the nature and situation of the premises and other circumstances, whether it is more probable that the grant included both rights of way, or that one of them was excluded (3).

The principle above stated must always be understood with this qualification, that the possession, from which the party would presume a grant of the easement, was with the knowledge of the person seised of an estate of inheritance. If a tenant for years or for life gives a license to another to enjoy an easement on his lands for above 20 years without interruption, this will not affect the person in reversion or remainder; but, on the determination of the particular estate, he may dispute the right to the easement, and the length of possession will not be evidence against him to presume a grant, unless it can be shown that he acquiesced (4). So, where a person made windows in his house, and had them for above 20 years, without any interruption from the occupier of the opposite premises, who occupied them under a lease, the Court of King's Bench held, that the possession of such an easement would not affect the landlord on the determination of the lease, and that he would not be liable to an action for raising the height of his own premises, and thereby obstructing the *light through the new windows (1). "It is true," said Mr. Justice Le Blanc in this case, "that presumptions are sometimes made against the owners of land during the possession and by the acquiescence of their tenants, as in * 124

(2) 1 Taunt. 284, 5.

(3) By Mansfield, C.J. and Chambre, J. in Ballard v. Dyson, 1 Taunt. 279.

(4) Bradbury v. Grinsel, 2 Saund. 175. *d.* in note.

(1) Daniel v. North, 11 East 372.

the instances of rights of way, and of common; but that happens, because the tenant suffers an immediate and palpable injury to his own possession, and therefore is presumed to be upon the alert to guard the rights of the landlord as well as his own, and to make common cause with him; but the same cannot be said of lights put out by the neighbours of the tenant, in which he may probably take no concern, as he may have no immediate interest at stake (*a*)."

(*a*) In the text, those cases have principally been considered, in which grants of incorporeal hereditaments have been presumed; but it is certain that the presumption arising from length of possession equally applies to lands and tenements. So, where M. died in possession of land, and his son and heir at law, succeeded to the possession and continued in the undisturbed possession of it for 18 years, it was held that a purchase of the title by the ancestor might be presumed. *Jackson d. M'Donald* v. *M'Call*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 377.

Where it appears that a party in possession is entitled to a conveyance under an agreement or trust, the presumption is strong that a conveyance has been executed accordingly: as, where an agreement for the sale and conveyance of a piece of land, dated in 1689 was produced in evidence, the jury were allowed in 1809, to presume a conveyance pursuant to the agreement. *Jackson d. Stoutenburgh & others* v. *Murray*, 7 *Johns. Rep.* 5. Where a person might have claimed a conveyance from a devisee, by virtue of a trust contained in the will of the devisor, and entered on the premises 50 years ago, and he and his heirs had had uninterrupted possession, as far as the lands were from their nature susceptible of possession, a deed is to be presumed. *Van Dyck* v. *Van Beuren*, 1 *Caines' Rep.* 84. A conveyance from trustees to *cestuy que trust* has been presumed in much less time than 20 years; as where trustees were directed to convey to a devisee upon his attaining the age of 21, it was held that the jury might presume a conveyance, although it appears that not more than four years had elapsed, since the devisee arrived at the age of 21; for as it was the duty of the trustees to convey, to which they might have been compelled by a court of equity, it was to be presumed that they had done their duty. *England d. Syburn* v. *Slade*, 4 *Term Rep.* 682. vide

In criminal cases.

Presumptive or circumstantial evidence, if admissible in civil cases, must obviously be equally admissible in criminal prosecutions; for, whether the remedy be of a civil or criminal nature, the modes of reasoning and of drawing conclusions from facts must necessarily be the same. Indeed, it must very commonly happen in some of the worst species of crimes, that this is the only kind of evidence

---

11 *Johns. Rep.* 456. On the same principle that what ought to have been done, shall be presumed to have been done, a reconveyance of the legal estate may be presumed after a length of time, and when the purpose for which it was conveyed has been answered. *Hillary* v. *Waller*, 12 *Vez. J.* 239. In the last cited case, the master of the rolls observes, that length of time does not by itself furnish the same sort of presumption in this case, that it does in a case of adverse possession. Long continued possession implies title; as if there were a different right, the probability is, that it would have been asserted. But undisturbed enjoyment does not show whether the title be equitable or legal. It does not follow however, that a conveyance of the legal estate, cannot be the subject of presumption, though the presumption is made upon a different ground. *Id.* 250, 251. A reconveyance by trustees will never be presumed where such reconveyance would be a breach of their trust. *Keen d. Byron & others* v. *Deardon*, 8 *East* 248. Where chattels were sold and a bill of sale given by the vendor, who notwithstanding continued in the uninterrupted possession of them, and his right had been acknowledged by the vendee, it was held that a reconveyance might be presumed. *Bigger's Administrator* v. *Alderson*, 1 *Hen. & Mun.* 54. What circumstances will justify the presumption of a deed is matter of law. *Stoever* v. *Lessee of Whitman*, 6 *Binney* 416.

Where the heirs of an intestate acquiesced for 20 years in the possession, by a purchaser, of the real estate of their ancestor, under a sale made by the administrator, it was presumed that the administrator took the oath and posted the notifications required by law previous to the sale; evidence being given of the order authorizing him to sell and of the actual sale. *Gray* v. *Gardner* 3 *Mass. Rep.* 399. So, where the question was on the validity of a title to land, derived under a collector's sale of more than 30 years, it was held that the jury were properly instructed to consider eve-

which can be resorted to; and it will often be the most satisfactory and convincing, that can be produced.

Where an act is in itself unlawful, it is presumed to be criminal, until the contrary appear. Thus, on a charge of murder, malice is presumed from the fact of killing: and if there are any circumstances of accident, necessity, or infirmity, of which the prisoner would avail himself in excuse or extenuation, they ought to be proved by the prisoner in his defence, unless they arise out of the evidence produced against him. On an indictment for larceny, proof that the stolen goods were found upon the prisoner is presumptive evidence against him of his having stolen them, so as to call upon him for his defence; and may be sufficient to convict him, if no facts appear in evi-
* 125 *dence to repel that presumption. This kind of evidence is frequently strengthened materially by other circumstances, as by proof that about the time of the offence the prisoner was near the spot from which the goods were taken, or that he gave some false account respecting the goods on being charged with the crime, or endeavoured to conceal them, or perhaps tried to prevent an inspection, or by some other proof of suspicious circumstances

---

ry thing as proved, which might be reasonably and fairly presumed from the fact and circumstances proved, as to the regularity of the tax bills, valuations, warrants, &c. *Coleman & another* v. *Anderson*, 10 *Mass. Rep.* 105.

After a long possession in severalty, a deed of partition may be presumed. *Hepburn & Dundas* v. *Auld*, 5 *Cranch* 262.

Where in a sale under a power contained in a mortgage, a drain of 10 feet in width was excepted, it was intended, after a lapse of 16 years from the sale, that the drain had antecedently existed, and was founded in usage, or was an exception in the previous deeds of the land. *Bergen* v. *Bennet*, 1 *Caines' Cas. in Error* 1. An original lease for a long term being produced, and proof given of possession for 70 years, it will be left to the jury to presume the mesne assignments. *Earl* v. *Baxter*, 2 *W. Black.* 1228.

Where a lease is proved and it is also shown that the claimant

in his behaviour (1). On the other hand, the inference arising from the mere fact of possession will often be much weakened, if any considerable time has elapsed between the loss of the property and the finding it again, or if the

(1) See other cases of presumptive evidence, in the next section; and see Index, tit. Presumption.

---

hath received rent within 20 years, this infers a seisin in fee, and throws it upon the adverse party to show that the lease is subsisting. And *Eyre*, Baron, held, that where rent is received without any proof of a lease, this also *prima facie* is evidence for the plaintiff, and obliges the defendant to show, that it is either a quit rent or that the term is unexpired. *Harpur* v. *Brock*, 3 *Wooddes.* 333. 2 *Bac. Abr.* 660. Possession and rent received for 20 years were held admissible evidence of a fee, to be left to a jury in a case where the only paper title produced by the plaintiff was the assignment of a term of 2000 years; for the lease (referred to in the assignment) is one of the muniments, not *as a lease*, but as a term to attend the inheritance. *Denn d. Tarzwell* v. *Barnard*, 2 *Cowp.* 595. Vide *Bac. Abr. Evidence.* (H).

Where one tenant in common has had 36 years sole and uninterrupted possession of the premises without any account to, or demand made, or claim set up by, his *companion*, this was held a sufficient ground for a jury to *presume* an *actual ouster*, of the co-tenant. *Doe d. Fishar & others* v. *Prosser*, 1 *Cowp.* 217. So, a sole possession under claim of right by one tenant in common for 42 years is sufficient to presume an ouster. *Van Dyck* v. *Van Beuren & Vosburg*, 1 *Caines' Rep.* 84.

Where a lease contains a clause of re-entry for non-payment of rent, and the lessor has been in possession for a length of time, subsequent to the commencement, and during the continuance of the term, a re-entry by the lessor may be presumed. *Jackson d. Smith & another* v. *Stewart*, 6 *Johns. Rep.* 34. The presumption has been admitted after a possession of 14 years. *Jackson d. Goose & others* v. *Demarest*, 2 *Caines' Rep.* 382. But not after a lapse of only nine years. *Jackson d. Donelly & others* v. *Walsh*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 226.

If a person claiming a toll for passing over a high-way, can show that the liberty of passing over the soil, and the taking of toll for such passage are both immemorial, and that the soil and the

property was from its nature likely to pass in the interval through many hands; especially, where the prisoner betrayed no appearance of guilt at the time of his apprehension (*a*).

A presumption of fact is in some cases made a presumption of law. Thus in the law of treason, an intention to kill the king may be reasonably inferred from a conspiracy to seize his person and imprison him. "Experience has shown," says Mr. Justice Foster (2), "that the distance is very small between the prisons and the graves of princes." This is a presumption of fact. But it is fully settled by the best authorities, that such a conspiracy is in law an overt act of compassing the king's death, and in itself a substantive act of high treason within the statute of Edward the third. The same observation applies to other acts, which have a less immediate and direct tendency to endanger the king's life, as entering into measures in concert with foreigners in order to effect an invasion of the kingdom; this also is an overt act of compassing the king's death (2). "It is a presumption of fact so obvious and so undeniable, that the law has adopted it, and made it a pre-
* 126 *sumption of law." So, on an indictment for the murder of a bastard child, the concealment of the death by the

(2) Fost. 196.

---

tolls were before the time of legal memory, in the same hands, though severed since, it shall be presumed that the soil was originally granted to the public, in consideration of the tolls. *Ld. Pelham* v. *Pickersgill*, 1 *Term Rep.* 660.

(*a*) Where a horse is stolen and is found in possession of a man at such a distance from the place where the horse was missing, in so short a time after as shows he must have come directly from that place, and without any loss of time, that is such evidence as a jury may infer the guilt of the prisoner upon, as it raises a violent presumption against him that he was the taker. It is however not conclusive. Any circumstance inducing a probability that the prisoner may have gotten him honestly, will render it improper for a jury to convict. *State* v. *Adams*, 1 *Hayw.* 463.

mother is a strong circumstance of suspicion against her, if the child is proved to have been born alive. But, unless that is proved, the mere fact of concealment is in its nature equivocal (*a*). However, by the statute of 21 J. 1. c. 27. the burden of proof was cast upon the mother; and unless she proved the negative, namely, that the child was not born alive, that statute did in effect make the concealment conclusive evidence of the murder. This act has been since repealed by the statute 43 G. 3. c. 58. s. 3.; by which the endeavour to conceal the birth is subject to a lighter punishment.*

Sect. III.

Evidence is to be confined to the Points in Issue.

As the sole object and end of evidence is to ascertain the truth of the several disputed facts or points in issue on the one side or on the other, no evidence ought to be admitted to any other point. Thus in an action of assumpsit, the defendant under the general issue of non assumpsit may give in evidence any thing which shows, that the plaintiff has not a good cause of action, or that nothing is due (1), as, performance, or payment (*b*); or may show a release (2), or

Non assumpsit.

(1) Bull. N. P. 152. (2) Bull. N. P. ib. 2 Campb. 558.

* The 4th section enacts, "that it may be lawful for the jury, by whose verdict any prisoner charged with such murder shall be acquitted, to find, in case it shall so appear in evidence, that the prisoner was delivered of issue of her body, which if born alive would have been bastard, and that she did by secret burying or otherwise endeavour to conceal the birth thereof, and thereupon it shall be lawful for the Court to adjudge, that such prisoner shall be committed to the common jail or house of correction for any time not exceeding two years."

(*a*) Vide *The State* v. *Love*, 1 *Bay* 167.

(*b*) Although made after the commencement of the suit, if before trial. *Bird* v. *Randall*, 3 *Burr.* 1345. *Baylies & another* v. *Fettyplace & another*, 7 *Mass. Rep.* 325.

accord and satisfaction (3), as a legal excuse for the non-performance; or that the contract was different from that
* 127 *stated (as, that it was made with the plaintiff and other persons not named (*a*) in the action (1), or with one of the plaintiffs alone) (2); or may disaffirm the contract by showing, that the plaintiff, who sues as a feme sole, was married at the time of the contract; or, that the defendant, who is sued as a feme sole, was then married; or, that the plaintiff was a bankrupt at the time (3); or may avoid the contract by showing that it was (*b*) usurious (4), or founded on a gaming transaction (5), or that the defendant was an infant (*c*) at the time of making the promise (6). But the defendant cannot, under the plea of non-assumpsit, show any matter, that would not go to the gist of the action, but merely to discharge it, as the statute of limitations (7). And though it should appear on the face of the declaration, that the cause of action did not arise within six years before the commencement of the action, yet the defendant can only take advantage of this, by pleading the statute. Nor will the defendant be allowed to prove under the general issue, that the contract was not with himself alone, as stated

(3) Paramore v. Johnson, 1 Lord Ray. 566. 12 Mod. 376. S. C.

(1) Leglise v. Champante, 2 Str. 820.

(2) Wilsford v. Wood, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 183.

(3) Bull. N. P. 153.

(4) 1 Str. 498. Bull. N. P. 152.

(5) 1 Ld. Ray. 89.

(6) 1 Salk. 279. Bull. N. P. 152. Gilb. Ev. 163.

(7) Bull. N. P. 152.

(*a*) Vide *Baker* v. *Jewell*, 6 *Mass. Rep.* 460. *Converse* v. *Symmes*, 10 *Mass. Rep.* 377.

(*b*) Vide *Cuyler* v. *Robinson*, 3 *Day* 68. *Levy* v. *Gadsby*, 3 *Cranch* 180.

(*c*) Vide *Wailing* v. *Toll*, 9 *Johns. Rep.* 389. *Stansbury* v. *Marks*, 4 *Dall.* 130. But infancy of the plaintiff must be pleaded in abatement. *Schermerhorn* v. *Jenkins*, 7 *Johns. Rep.* 373.

A want of jurisdiction in the Court must in general be pleaded in abatement; but it may be shown, under the general issue, that there is no court in the country which has jurisdiction of the cause. *Rea* v. *Hayden*, 3 *Mass. Rep.* 24.

in the declaration (*d*), but jointly with other persons still living (8); for proof that another contracted is not evidence, that the defendant himself did not contract. Such an objection can only avail when the fact is pleaded in abatement. And although it should appear on the evidence produced on the part of the plaintiff, that other persons are liable as joint contractors with the defendant, this is no variance, and the plaintiff will be entitled to recover (9). But the plaintiff, in an action for money had and received by the defendants, cannot give evidence of money received by the defendants and another partner *since deceased;* for, in such a case there cannot be a plea in abatement, as if the other partner were still alive (10) (*e*).

*The rule, which has been just laid down with respect to joint contracts, either written or by parol, applies also to the case of joint bonds. If an action is brought against one obligor alone who pleads non est factum, the plaintiff may maintain his action, notwithstanding that on the production of the bond there appears to be a joint obligor (1) (*a*). The plea of non est factum puts in issue, whether it be the defendant's deed at the time of pleading. Evidence is therefore admissible under this plea, to show that, at the time of pleading, the deed was by the rules of common law absolutely void (2); as, that the defendant was at the time of the execution a lunatic (3), or a married woman (4), or

* 128

Non est factum.

(8) Rice v. Shute, 5 Burr. 2611. Abbot v. Smith, 2 Blac. Rep. 946. Cowp. 832.

(9) Germain v. Frederick, and Evans v. Lewis, 1 Saund. 291. *c. d.* in note.

(10) Spalding v. Mure and others, 6 T. R. 363. 5.

(1) Whelpdale's case, 5 Rep. 119. Cabell v. Vaughan, 1 Saund. 291.

(2) Whelpdale's case, 5 Rep. 119.

(3) Yates v. Boen, 2 Str. 1104.

(4) Anon. C. 12 Mod. 609. Lambert v. Atkins, 2 Campb. 272. Bull. N. P. 172.

(*d*) Vide *Ziele* v. *Executors of Campbell*, 2 *Johns. Cas.* 382. *Robinson* v. *Fisher*, 3 *Caines' Rep.* 99.

(*e*) A promise must be proved to have been made by all the defendants, who are laid in the declaration to have made it, otherwise the plaintiff will fail under the general issue. *Tom* v. *Goodrich and others*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 213.

(*a*) Vide 1 *Bos. & Pul.* 72.

that he was made to sign it when so drunk (*b*) as not to know what he did (5), or that the deed was delivered as an escrow on a condition not performed (6) (*c*). For the same reason the defendant may show, that, after the delivery of the deed and before the time of bringing the action, the deed has been altered in a material point by some addition, or rasure, or interlineation, &c.; for then at the time of pleading, it was not the defendant's deed, but absolutely void (7). And the rule is the same, whether such a material alteration was made by the obligee, or by a stranger without his privity; the deed is void in either case. It was resolved in Pigot's case (8), that if the obligee alters the deed, though in words not material, the deed is void; but if a stranger, without his privity, alters the deed in any point *not material*, it will not avoid the deed. The defendant, under the general plea of non est factum, cannot prove payment, or give in evidence a release, or accord and satisfaction; and if the deed is merely voidable, (as, by reason of his infancy, or for duress of his person,) he may plead such matter, and so avoid the deed; but cannot give
* 129 it in evidence under the *plea of non est factum, for at the time of pleading, it had not been avoided, and was his deed (1). Even in cases, where it is enacted by the legislature that the deed shall be void, (as, by stat. 9 Ann. c. 14. s. 1. for gaming, by stat. 5, 6 Ed. 6. c. 16. s. 2, 3. for sale of office, by 12 Ann. st. 2. c. 12. s. 2. for simony, and by stat. 13 Eliz. c. 8. for usury,) the defendant cannot

(5) Bull. N. P. 172.
(6) 5 Rep. 119. *b*. Bull. N. P. 172. Stoytes v. Pearson, 4 Esp. N. P. C. 255.
(7) 5 Rep. 119. *b*. Pigot's case, 11 Rep. 27.
(8) 11 Rep. 27.
(1) 5 Rep. 119.

(*b*) *Pitt* v. *Smith*, 3 *Campb*. 33. But it seems that the intoxication must have arisen by the contrivance of the plaintiff. *Johnson* v. *Medlicott*, 3 *P. Wms*. 130.

(*c*) Or that a different instrument was substituted, instead of the one which the defendant supposed he was executing. *Van Valkenburgh* v. *Rouk*, 12 *Johns. Rep*. 337.

take advantage of this under the plea of non est factum, but ought to plead the special matter (2).

Not guilty, in trespass.

In an action of trespass for assault and battery, the defendant cannot give in evidence, under the general issue, that he was first assaulted by the plaintiff, except in mitigation of damages: but with that view the evidence is admissible. In trespass *quare clausum fregit*, evidence of title and of right of possession is admissible under the general issue; as, a demise from the owner of the land (3); or, that the plaintiff's interest in the premises, which he had occupied under the defendant, had expired (4): or the defendant may prove, that at the time of the supposed trespass the freehold and right of possession were in a third person, and that he entered by his command (5). Such evidence falsifies the declaration, by showing that the defendant did not break the close, as is stated in the declaration (6). But the defendant under this plea cannot prove a license from the plaintiff (7), or defect of the plaintiff's fences (8), or right of common (9), or right of way (10), or other easement (11). Formerly, he could not have proved that he entered to take a distress for a rent-charge (12); but this evidence is now admissible under the general issue, by stat. 11 G. 2. c. 19. s. 21. In trespass for taking goods, the defendant may prove under the general issue, that the *goods were put into his custody as pound-keeper, and that as such he detained them (1). * 130

Issue on custom.

When a right is claimed by custom in a particular manor or parish, proof of a similar custom in an adjoining parish or manor is not admissible evidence. In the Duke of Somerset's case (2), Lord Ch. J. Raymond said, he had

(2) 5 Rep. 119.
(3) Dodd v. Kyffin, 7 T. R. 354.
(4) Argent v. Durrant, 8 T. R. 403.
(5) Diersley's case, 1 Leon. 301. 8 T. R. 403.
(6) Gilb. Ev. 221.
(7) Gilb. Ev. 216. 2 T R. 166. 8.
(8) Co. Lit. 283. *a*. Gilb. Ev. 216.
(9) Id.
(10) Gilb. Ev. 217. 220.
(11) Hawkins v. Wallis, 2 Wils. 173.
(12) Co. Lit. 283. *a*.
(1) Badkin v. Chancellor and others, Cowp. 476.
(2) D. of Somerset v. France, 1 Str. 661. Ruding v. Newel, 2 Str. 957. Furneaux v. Hutchins, Cowp. 807. By Buller, J. in Noble v. Kennoway, 2 Doug. 512. S. P.; by Wood, B. in Doe dem. Foster v. Sisson, 12 East 63. S. P. 3 Gwill. 965.

always looked upon it as a settled principle in the law, that the customs of one manor should not be given in evidence to explain the custom of another manor; for, if this kind of evidence were to be allowed, the consequence seems to be, that it would let in the custom of one manor into another, and in time bring the customs of all manors to be the same. And, in addition to this argument of inconvenience the objection taken to the evidence in that case, namely, that it was inapplicable to the point in dispute, appears to be very strong; customs being different in different manors, and in their nature distinct. Unless therefore some connexion or relation is proved to have existed between them, as, by showing that they were all formerly holden under the same lord, or that the one manor was anciently parcel of the other manor (3), such evidence is not admissible.

But several cases appear to have determined this point, that, where all the manors within a certain district are held by the same peculiar tenure, and a question arises in any one of them upon an incident to the tenure, evidence may be given of the usage, which prevails in any of the other manors within the district. The first reported case of this kind is Champian v. Atkinson (4), where the question was, whether a general fine was due to an infant preceding lord during his minority: and the defendants were allowed to give in evidence upon the trial of this issue, that other ad-
* 131 *joining manors had the same custom, not to pay to the lord before he attained his full age: and similar evidence was there said to have been received, on a question of copyhold tenure, between certain manors in Middlesex. On the authority of this case of Champian v. Atkinson, the Duke of Somerset's case (1) was principally decided. On a trial at bar in that case, where the issue was, whether a general fine was due from the tenants of certain manors in Cum-

(3) Moulin v. Dalison, Cro. Car. 484.

(4) 3 Keb. 90., on Tr. at bar.

(1) D. of Somerset v. France, 1 Str. 658. See also Lowther v. Raw and others, Fortesc. 44. 55., S. P., on appeal to the H. of Lords from the judgment of Lord Talbot, Ch.; Dean and Chapter of Ely v. Warren, 2 Atk. 189. S. P. See also Cowp. 807, 8.; and 1 Maule & Sel. 662.

berland to the Duke as next admitting lord, the Court after much argument admitted evidence, that the same fines had been paid in similar cases to the lords of other manors. Lord Ch. J. Raymond, and Reynolds, J. laid down the general rule as above stated, and were strongly against admitting the evidence; but afterwards agreed to receive it, on the authority of the precedent in Keble, and of cases said to have been so ruled on the northern circuit. Fortescue, J. the only other judge present, thought the evidence admissible, and made a distinction between the *custom* and the *tenure* of a manor; and as the question there to be tried merely concerned the tenure of the plaintiff's manors, he was of opinion that it would be proper to inquire, what were the qualities that attended other estates holden by the same tenure. So in the case of Furneaux v. Hutchins, on a question relative to the custom of tithing (2), Lord Mansfield, after laying down the general rule, that "proof of the custom in one parish is not evidence to affect another parish," adds this qualification, "unless the custom is laid as a general custom of the country." Thus, where half of a river belongs, by the constant custom of the country, to the lords of the manors on each side of the water, proof of the custom in one manor is evidence of the same customary right in another (3). It is evidence of a custom pervading one common district of manors.

*In the cases which have been cited, proof of a general right over one entire district was admitted to explain and affect the rights of different persons in different parts. Upon the same principle, the late case of Sir Thomas Stanley v. White (1) was determined. This was an action of trespass for cutting down the plaintiff's trees; the defendant pleaded his soil and freehold in the close, upon which the trees were growing, &c.; the plaintiff replied, that the trees were his trees and freehold. It appeared on the trial, that the trees in question grew in a woody belt, of considerable extent, entire and undivided, which encir- * 132

(2) Cowp. 808.
(3) 1 Maule & Sel. 662.
(1) 14 East 332.

cled the plaintiff's manor, and lay contiguous to a number of closes belonging to several owners, one of which closes was that of the defendant. Evidence was admitted of several acts of ownership, in different parts of the belt, by those under whom the plaintiff claimed, which had been acquiesced in by the owners of the adjoining land. And the Court of King's Bench afterwards, on a motion for a new trial, adjudged the evidence to have been properly admitted, as evidence of the general right through the whole extent of the enclosure.

The general rule, then, is, that a custom of tithing, &c. in one parish is not evidence of a custom in another. So in an action by a rector for tithes, where the point in issue is, whether there exists a modus of a certain sum of money for a particular farm in a township within the parish, the defendant will not, in general, be allowed to inquire, whether other farms in the same township are not subject to the same payment. Such an inquiry, however, may be very proper *on the other side*, in cross-examination, for the purpose of showing that such payments cannot be a modus, consistently with the evidence which has been previously adduced. This was lately adjudged to be admissible in the case of Blundell v. Howard (2). The question there was not put by the *defendant* with a view of supporting the *modus set up by him; but was put by the *plaintiffs*, in order to show, that this and similar payments by the occupiers of different tenements were merely portions of a sum in gross paid throughout the township by way of composition, and could not be a modus, since the ecclesiastical surveys, which had been produced on the part of the rector, were entirely silent as to any modus co-extensive with the township.

* 133

Proof of *other* acts, &c.

In the case of Hunter v. Gibson and Johnson (1), which was an action by an indorsee against the defendants as acceptors of an instrument purporting to be a bill of exchange,

(2) 1 Maul. & Sel. 292.

(1) 2 H. Bl. 187. 288. 290. 295. See 7 East 40.

a question arose on the third count, which stated the bill to be *payable to bearer*, under the following circumstances: It appeared in evidence, that the name of the person mentioned as payee was merely fictitious, but this fact was not known to the plaintiff; and for the purpose of showing, that the defendants, at the time of their acceptance, either knew the name in the bill to be fictitious, or that the defendants had given authority to the drawer to draw *the bill produced* payable to a fictitious person, the plaintiff proposed to prove, that the defendants had given a *general authority* to the drawer to draw bills of exchange upon them, to be made payable to fictitious persons, and evidence to this effect was produced; the counsel for the defendants objected to this evidence, on the ground, that it had no relation to the *particular bill in question*, and that the facts of any particular transaction could not legally be inferred from circumstances which applied wholly to *other* transactions. Lord Kenyon, who tried the cause, admitted the evidence; upon which, the counsel for the defendants tendered a bill of exceptions. The Court of King's Bench gave judgment for the defendant in error (*a*). A writ of

---

(*a*) In an action on the case for giving a false character of one Johnson as to solvency, Lord Kenyon admitted a witness to prove that the defendant had recommended Johnson to him as a man entitled to credit, and in good circumstances; in consequence of which he had trusted him with goods and been defrauded of them, Johnson being a man of no property; as the testimony proved a subsisting fraudulent connexion between the defendant and Johnson. *Beal* v. *Thatcher*, 3 *Esp. Rep.* 194.

In an action of trover for goods which had been fraudulently obtained by the defendant and one L. from the plaintiff, it was held that subsequent acts of collusion and fraud by the defendant and L. to obtain goods from other persons were admissible to show their intent in the previous transaction between them and the plaintiff. *Allison* v. *Matthieu*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 235. Where there were strong circumstances to suspect that a note had been fraudulently altered, it was held that corroborating circumstances, (as that other notes drawn and indorsed by the same parties, to take up one of which

error was then brought in the House of Lords; and the question on the admissibility of the evidence was referred to the judges. On this question there was a division among
* 134 *the judges; but the majority of them being of opinion, that the evidence ought to have been received and left to the jury, the judgment below was affirmed (1).

In trespass for taking goods, the plaintiff can only prove the taking of such goods as are mentioned in the declaration. And in trespass for assault and battery, or *quare clausum fregit*, where the declaration charges, that the defendant on a certain day, and on divers other days, between that day and the commencement of the suit, assaulted, &c. the plaintiff may prove any number of trespasses within those limits; or he may prove a trespass beyond the remotest day, waiving all the rest (2). And even after

(1) See infra, p. 137. as to *proof of knowledge* in issuing counterfeit money.

(2) Bull. N. P. 86.

---

the note in question had been given, were altered,) were admissible to strengthen the suspicions. *Rankin* v. *Blackwell*, 2 *Johns. Cas.* 198. In an action against A. B. & C., for a conspiracy among themselves to defraud such merchants and traders as they should be able to impose upon, by representing A., who was a bankrupt, as a man of large property and safely to be trusted: evidence that the defendants made such representations to other persons than the plaintiff, in consequence of which such persons, without the request of the defendants, recommended A. to the plaintiff, whereby the plaintiff was induced to give him a credit, was held admissible. In this case the court say that direct evidence was not to be required or expected: nor was it requisite that the circumstantial evidence should have a direct relation to the immediate subject of inquiry; much less that the inference drawn from the circumstances proved, should be absolutely certain or necessary. It is sufficient if the evidence be such as to produce a fair and reasonable presumption of the facts in issue, and if it has that tendency, it ought to be received and left to the consideration of the jury, to whom alone it belongs to determine upon the precise force and effect of the circumstances proved. *Gardner* v. *Preston*, 2 *Day* 205.

proving several assaults within the days mentioned in the declaration, perhaps he would be allowed to give evidence of assaults committed before that time, as proof of the defendant's malice. So, in an action for criminal conversation, the plaintiff may prove several acts of adultery within the times specified; and in addition to this, he may show indecent familiarities antecedent to the first-mentioned day, though he cannot show a previous criminal connexion.

In an action for slander, the plaintiff, after proving the words as laid in the declaration, may show also, that the defendant spoke other actionable words either before or afterwards (3) (*a*), or that he published other libels (4). This evidence is admissible for the purpose of proving the defendant's malice in publishing or speaking the words which are the subject of the action. And the distinction, which was at one time made between words actionable and such as are not actionable, (that, in the latter case they might be given in evidence, but not in the former,) (5) has *been since overruled (1). In the last case on this subject, * 135
Finnerty v. Tipper (2), which was an action for a libel published in a periodical work, Mansfield, C. J. refused to admit in evidence subsequent numbers of the same work, unless they expressly referred to the libel for which the action was brought; for the subsequent publication, he said, might contain the most scandalous imputations, while the former libel may have been almost nothing; and the necessary consequence must be, that the jury would give damages for the second libel in an action for the first, although the defendant would not have the same opportunity of proving the truth of its contents, as if it were made the

(3) Charlter v. Barrett, Peake N. P. C. 22. Rustell v. Macquister, 1 Campb. 49. Tate v. Humphrey, 2 Campb. 73 (*b*).

(4) R. v. Pearce, Peake N. P. C. 74. Lee v. Huson, Peake N. P. C. 166. Plunkett v. Cobbett, MS. case in 2 Sel. N. P. 938.

(5) Mead v. Daubigny, Peake N. P. C. 125.

(1) Rustell v. Macquister, 1 Campb. 49. And see cases cited above.

(2) 2 Campb. 72.

(*a*) S. P. *Wallis* v. *Mease*, 3 *Binney* 546.

subject of a distinct action. The Chief Justice was of opinion that the same restriction was proper, and had been observed, in actions for words spoken, namely, that the subsequent words ought to refer to the same subject; and he drew a distinction between the case then before him and that of Carr v. Hood, which had been cited for the admissibility of the evidence; the defence there was, that the publication in question was fair criticism on the writings of the plaintiff, and, therefore, any other papers published by the defendant, to show that he was actuated by malice in publishing the libel complained of, were certainly admissible evidence. On a review of the cases, which have been above cited, it will be found that in all of them except two, namely, Lee v. Huson and Rustell v. Macquister, the subsequent words or libels, offered in evidence, did expressly refer to those which were the subject of the action; and in those two cases, it does not appear from the reports, whether they had, or had not, such a reference (*a*).

In criminal cases.

The same rule applies, if possible, more strongly to criminal prosecutions; in which all manner of evidence ought to be rejected, that is foreign to the point in issue (*b*). * 136 This *rule is founded in common justice; for no person can be expected to answer unprepared, at once, for every action of his life. In treason, therefore, no evidence is to be admitted of any overt act, that is not expressly laid in the indictment. This was the rule at common law; and it is again prescribed and enforced by the statute (1) of Wm. 3.

(1) 7 W. 3. c. 3. s. 8.

(*a*) In an action on the case *per quod*, &c. for debauching the plaintiff's daughter, it has been held that the daughter was not a competent witness to prove a promise of marriage, in order to increase the damages; that being a distinct cause, for which she has herself a right of action against the defendant. *Tullidge* v. *Wade*, 3 *Wils.* 18. *Foster* v. *Scoffield*, 1 *Johns. Rep.* 297. *Dodd* v. *Norris*, 3 *Campb.* 519.

(*b*) Vide *The United States* v. *Mitchell*, 2 *Dall.* 357.

which contains an express provision to that effect, in consequence of some encroachments that had been made in several state prosecutions (2). The meaning of the rule is, not that the whole detail of facts should be set forth, but that no overt act amounting *to a distinct independent charge*, though falling under the same head of treason, shall be given in evidence, unless it be expressly laid in the indictment; but still, if it amount to a direct proof of any of the overt acts which are laid, it may be brought as evidence of such overt acts (3).

On the trial of an indictment for burglary and larceny (4), it appeared upon the evidence, that the prisoners might have entered the house before it was dark, and that they had not taken any part of the goods at the time when they were discovered in the house; upon which, the counsel for the prosecution proposed to give evidence of a larceny in the house committed by the prisoners on a preceding day; but the Court rejected the evidence, on the ground that it tended to prove a felony of a totally distinct kind; the prisoners were, therefore, acquitted on this charge, but afterwards indicted again for the other offence and convicted.

For the same reason, it would not be allowable to show, on the trial of an indictment, that the prisoner has a general disposition to commit the same kind of offence as that charged against him. Thus, in a prosecution for an infamous crime, an admission by the prisoner that he had *committed such an offence at another time and with another person, and that he had a tendency to such practices, ought not to be admitted (1). But on an indictment for uttering a bank note, knowing it to be forged, proof that the prisoner had passed other forged notes of the same kind, is evidence that he knew the note in question to be forged (2); and on a prosecution for uttering counterfeit * 137

(2) Foster, 245, 6.
(3) Id.
(4) R. v. Vandercomb and Abbot, 2 Leach Cr. C. 816.

(1) R. v. Cole, Mich. term, 1810, by all the judges, MS.
(2) R. v. Wylie, 1 New Rep. 92. R. v. Ball, 1 Campb. 324.

money, the fact of the prisoner having other counterfeit money upon him, or of his having uttered other pieces of money of the same kind, is evidence of his having known that the money which he uttered was counterfeit (3). Such evidence, far from being foreign to the point in issue, is extremely material; for the head of the offence charged upon the prisoner is, that he did the act with knowledge; and it would seldom be possible to ascertain, under what circumstance the uttering took place, whether from ignorance or with an intention to commit a fraud, without inquiring into the demeanour of the prisoner in the course of other transactions. The more detached in point of time the previous utterings are, the less relation they will bear to that stated in the indictment: and the question then would be, whether the evidence is sufficient to warrant the inference of knowledge at one time, from such particular transactions at another time (4). That is a question entirely for the jury. But whatever weight the evidence may have, (which is quite another consideration,) it is clearly admissible; not as evidence of *another offence*, but simply of *another transaction*, in which the prisoner was engaged (5). The same kind of proof is constantly admitted in trials for murder; in which, former grudges and antecedent menaces are evidence of the prisoner's malice against the deceased (*a*).

* 138 *The plea of not guilty puts in issue all the material parts of the indictment; and under this plea the prisoner may give in evidence any matter of justification, excuse, or extenuation. And if some *other acts* of the prisoner, besides those which are the subject of the indictment, are proved against him for the purpose of showing his design in the affair in question, he will be allowed to explain those

(3) 1 New Rep. 95.

(4) Id. 94. See supra, as to presumptive evidence; and Hunter v. Gibson and Johnson, supra, p. 133.

(5) See also Rickman's case, 2 East P. C. 1035.

(*a*) Vide *State* v. *Green*, *Kirby* 87.

parts of his conduct, and with this view may give in evidence other *contemporaneous* particulars of his conduct, which show that he had a different design from that imputed to him. This limitation, (namely, that the particulars offered in evidence by the prisoner ought to be *contemporaneous* with those proved on the other side, or at least confined within the same limits to which the evidence on the part of the prosecution is subject,) appears to be not unreasonable; for otherwise the prisoner would be at liberty to take the whole range of his life, in the course of which his character and his designs may have undergone a complete change. This observation, however, is made with great deference; as the rule certainly appears to have been carried much further in one of the modern state trials, in the case of Horne Tooke (1). In that case several publications were given in evidence, on the part of the crown, containing republican opinions, which had been distributed by the prisoner *during the period assigned in the indictment for the existence of the conspiracy;* and this evidence was much relied on, as showing that the notion of a reform, which was expected to be set up by the prisoner in his defence, was a mere pretext to cover his treasonable designs; to repel this conclusion, the counsel for the prisoner offered in evidence a book, which had been written by the prisoner 12 *years before*, on the subject of parliamentary reform; the evidence was objected to, as having no relation with the particular transaction in question, and because the prisoner's opinions, whatever they were formerly, might have afterwards changed. But Lord Ch. J. Eyre said, that the *question was not whether this book had a reference to the conspiracy charged, but whether it had not reference to the proof given in support of the charge; and he thought it evidence to rebut the supposition, that the reform of parliament was a pretence made by the prisoner. The book was accordingly received in evidence. * 139

(1) 1 East P. C. 61.

Evidence of character

As evidence is to be confined to the points in issue, the character of either party cannot be inquired into, in a civil suit, unless it is put in issue by the nature of the proceeding itself (1). Thus, in an action of ejectment by an heir at law, to set aside a will for fraud and imposition committed by the defendant, witnesses cannot be examined to the defendant's good character (2). So, on the trial of an information against the defendant for keeping false weights, where it was proposed to call witnesses on behalf of his character, Eyre, C. B. ruled, that such evidence was not admissible in a civil suit (3). "The offence imputed is not," he said, "in the shape of a crime. To admit such evidence would be contrary to the true line of distinction, which is this, that in a direct prosecution for a crime it is admissible, but where the prosecution is not directly for the crime but for the penalty, it is not. If evidence to character were admissible in such a case as this, it would be necessary to try character in every charge of fraud upon the excise and custom-house laws (*a*)."

But in an action for criminal conversation with the plaintiff's wife, evidence may be given of the wife's general bad character for want of chastity, or of particular acts of adultery committed by her *before* she became acquainted with the defendant (4) (*b*). This evidence is al-

(1) Bull. N. P. [298.]
(2) Goodright dem. Farr v. Hicks, Bull. N. P. 296.
(3) Attorney-General v. Bowman, 2 Bos. & Pull. 532. (a).
(4) Bull. N. P. 27. 296. Roberts v. Mulston, MS. case in Selw. N. P. 25.

(*a*) It has been held, that in actions of tort, and especially such as charge a defendant with gross depravity upon circumstances merely, evidence of uniform integrity and good character is admissible to repel the charge. *Ruan* v. *Perry*, 3 *Caines' Rep.* 20.

(*b*) In an action for a breach of a promise of marriage, the defendant may give in evidence in mitigation of damages, the general conduct of the plaintiff as to chastity, whether before or after the time he made the promise to her, or to the period of the proposed marriage. *Johnson* v. *Caulkins*, 1 *Johns. Cas.* 116.

lowed in mitigation of damages. So it may be proved, in mitigation of damages, that the plaintiff himself has carried on a criminal *conversation with other women (1); or that the plaintiff's wife made the first advances to the defendant (2). Also, in an action for a libel, imputing a crime to the plaintiff, in consequence of which he complained of having lost the society of his acquaintance, the defendant on the general issue has been allowed to show, in mitigation of damages, that, before and at the time of the publication of the supposed libel, the plaintiff was generally suspected of the crime imputed to him, and that on account of this suspicion his acquaintance had ceased to associate with him (3) (*a*). Such evidence however is not admissible, where the defendant by his plea puts in issue the truth of the charge imputed (4) (*b*). And in an action for a malicious prosecution, the defendant after proving circumstances of suspicion against the plaintiff, may give evidence of his general bad character, in order to show that he had probable cause for instituting the prosecution (5) (*c*).

* 140

(1) Bull. N. P. 27. Duberley v. Gunning, 4 T. R. 658. Bromley v. Wallace, 4 Esp. N. P. C. 237. Lord Kenyon, in two cases, (Wyndham v. Ld. Wycomb, 4 Esp. N. P. C. 16., and another case there cited,) held such proof to be a *bar* to the plaintiff's action. But now this is not so considered.

(2) Elsam v. Fawcett, 2 Esp. N. P. C. 562. Gardiner v. Jadis, MS. case in Selw. N. P. 25.

(3) Ld. Leicester v. Walter, 2 Campb. 251.; and three other cases there cited by counsel, S. P., & —— v. Moor, 1 Maul. Sel. 284.

(4) Snowdon v. Smith, ruled by Heath, J. 1 Maul. Sel. 286. (a).

(5) Rodriguez v. Tadmire, 2 Esp. N. P. C. 720.

(*a*) Sed vide 6 *Mass. Rep.* 518. and see *Foot* v. *Tracy*, 1 *Johns. Rep.* 46. In the last case the question was whether the defendant in an action for a libel, should be allowed to give evidence under the general issue, of the general bad character of the plaintiff in mitigation of damages. The court was equally divided, Kent, Ch. J. and Thompson, J. being for, and Livingston and Tompkins, Js. against admitting the evidence.

(*b*) Vide *Wolcott* v. *Hall*, 6 *Mass. Rep.* 514. 3 *Mass. Rep.* 553.

(*c*) In an action of slander, the plaintiff may give in evidence to aggravate the damages, his own rank and condition of life, and also the defendant may avail himself of such evidence, when it

In trials for felony the prisoner is always permitted to call witnesses to his general character; and when the evidence against him is doubtful, such testimony may be sufficient to warrant an acquittal (*d*). The same rule seems to apply with equal force to trials for misdemeanors, where the direct object of the prosecution is to punish the offence. So, on the trial of an indictment for a rape, evidence is admissible on the part of the prisoner, that the woman bore a notoriously bad character for want of chastity and common decency, or that she had previously been criminally connected with the prisoner. In such a prosecution, however, it cannot be shown that she had a criminal connexion with *other* persons (6).

*141 *As the jury are bound to try only the matter in issue between the parties, no evidence need be given to prove any points which are admitted on record, and none can be received to contradict the record (1). Thus in an action for cutting down trees, if the plaintiff replies to the defendant's plea of soil and freehold, that the trees were his trees and freehold, &c., he thereby admits the plea of the defendant, and cannot dispute that he had the freehold of the soil. So, if a tenant justifies for common, and the issue on the right of common is found for the demandant, the jury cannot find, that the tenant did not put in his cattle; for that is admitted (2). So, in an action of debt on award, where the defendant pleads *no such award*, the jury cannot find matters which make the award void, if they are not contained in the award itself (3).

The same rule will apply to judgments by default, to

(6) Hodgson's case, by a majority of the judges on a case reserved. 1812. MS.

(1) Bull. N. P. [293.]

(2) Com. Dig. tit. Pleader. (S. 17.)

(3) 2 Roll. Ab. 692. l. 25.

---

will have a legal tendency to mitigate the damages. *Larned* v. *Buffinton*, 3 *Mass. Rep.* 551.

(*d*) Vide *Commonwealth* v. *Hardy*, 2 *Mass. Rep.* 317.

the payment of money into court, and to particulars of demand under a Judge's order. The effect of these is here shortly considered.

Judgment by default.

First, as to judgments by default.—A judgment by default is an admission of the cause of action. Thus in an action on a bill of exchange against the defendant as acceptor, it admits that he accepted it, and that the bill is as stated in the declaration; and he cannot afterwards show on the execution of a writ of inquiry, that he had not accepted it (4); the bill must, indeed, be produced, for the purpose of seeing whether there is any indorsement of money having been paid upon it (5). So, in an action for goods sold and delivered, or for money had and received, the defendant by suffering judgment to go by default admits that something is due; and he cannot afterwards dispute the contract of sale, or show fraud on the part of the plaintiff *in making the contract (1); but the plaintiff will only have to prove the amount due to him. So, on the execution of a writ of inquiry after judgment on demurrer, the defendant cannot controvert any thing but the amount of the sum in demand; as, in an action for goods sold and delivered, to which the defendant pleaded coverture, and the plaintiff replied, that the defendant's husband had resided abroad, and that the defendant during all the time, &c. had carried on trade as a feme sole, the Court were of opinion, that after judgment on demurrer to this replication, evidence of the wife having acted as agent to the husband ought not to have been admitted on the execution of the writ of inquiry; that the only question to be decided by the jury was on the amount of the debt, and that the question whether the debt had been contracted by the defendant, as agent for her husband, or in

* 142

(4) Green v. Hearne, 3 T. R. 301. Bevis v. Lindfell, 2 Str. 1149.

(5) 3 T. R. 302. Billers v. Bowles, Barnes Rep. 233. Ellis v. Wall, ib.

(1) East Ind. Comp. v. Glover, 1 Str. 612.

her separate capacity, ought to have been considered as determined by the record (2) (*a*).

Payment of money into court.

Secondly, as to payment of money into court.—Such payment is in general an acknowledgment of the right of action to the amount of the particular sum (3) (*b*). And as it is an acknowledgment on record, the party cannot recover it back, although he has paid it wrongfully or by mistake (4). It is an admission by the defendant that the plaintiff has a legal demand to a certain extent; but it is not an acknowledgment beyond that amount, and will not preclude the defendant from taking any objection to the action with respect to any other part of the demand, to which the payment of the money does not apply, although if no money had been brought into court, the objection might have been a bar to the whole demand (5). Where there is a count on a special contract together with money counts, payment of money generally upon the whole de-
* 143 claration is *an admission of the contract on every count, to which the contract is in its nature applicable (1): and

(2) De Gaillon v. L'Aigle, 1 Bos. and Pull. 368.
(3) 5 Burr. 2640. 1 T. R. 465. 2 East 134.
(4) Vaughan v. Barnes, 2 Bos. & Pull. 392. 2 T. R. 645.
(5) Cox v. Parry, 1 T. R. 464.
(1) Bennet v. Francis, 2 Bos. & Pull. 550.

(*a*) In an action on a joint contract against two, where one has suffered a default, and the other has obtained a verdict, judgment must be arrested as to the defendant suffering the default. 1 *Str.* 610. n. 1. 1 *Sell. Pr.* 358. *Champlin* v. *Tilley*, 3 *Day* 307. in which last case judgment was directed to be entered for both defendants. *Aliter* in actions for torts, unless the bar or justification of one of the defendants destroy the plaintiff's cause of action against all. *Biggs* v. *Benger and Greenfield*, 2 *Lord Raym.* 1372. S. C. 1 *Str.* 610. Vide *Anderson* v. *Henshaw*, 3 *Day* 272.

(*b*) In an action on a policy of insurance, it was held that paying money into court was an admission of the cause of action as alleged in the declaration. *Johnston* v. *Columbian Insurance Company*, 7 *Johns. Rep.* 315. But paying money into court to the amount of a partial loss, upon a valued policy of insurance, is not an admission of a total loss. *Rucker* v. *Palsgrave*, 1 *Taunt.* 419.

after such an admission the defendant will be precluded from disputing the existence of the contract as stated. Thus in an action on a bill of exchange, the defendant, by paying money into court generally, dispenses with the regular proof of the party's hand-writing (2), and cannot object to the sufficiency of the stamp on which the bill is drawn (3). So, in an action of covenant, he admits the execution of the deed (4). So, where the plaintiff brought an action for work and labour as a surgeon, the defendant by paying money into court admitted his right to recover in that character, and was not allowed to dispute it at the trial (5). And payment of money into court has been held to be a conclusive admission of the plaintiff's right to sue in that court (6). So, where the defendant paid money into court generally upon a declaration containing a count on a policy of insurance together with money counts, he was not afterwards permitted to show, that the policy was originally different, and had been altered by the broker without his knowledge (7). But if the plaintiff previous to the trial has induced the defendant to believe, that the only point to be tried would be a question of fraud, and has suffered him to prepare his evidence for that purpose, the court will not allow the plaintiff to object to the receipt of that evidence at the trial, on the ground of the contract having been admitted by the payment of money into court. This was determined by the Court of Common Pleas in the case of Muller v. Hartshorne (8). Lord Alvanley, C. J. on the trial of that case, allowed the defendant to prove fraud on the part of the plaintiff, in order to avoid the instrument (9). But the court afterwards declined giving any opinion on that point, *because under * 144

(2) Gutteridge v. Smith, 2 H. Bl. 374.

(3) Israel v. Benjamin, 3 Campb. 40.

(4) Randal v. Lynch, 2 Campb. 357. Watkins v. Towers, 2 T. R. 275.

(5) Lipscombe v. Holmes, 2 Campb. 441.

(6) Miller v. Williams, 5 Esp. N. P. C. 19.

(7) Andrews v. Palsgrave, 9 East 325.

(8) 3 Bos. & Pull. 556.

(9) Id. and see 2 Bos. & Pull. 392.

the circumstances of the case the plaintiff was not at liberty to avail himself of that objection.

Payment of money into court is an admission only of a *legal* demand. If the contract declared upon be illegal, the defendant cannot give it validity by his admission; no admission of the parties will oblige the court to give effect to an illegal transaction (1). And although paying money into court admits the contract, that is, the entire consideration for the act and the entire act which is to be done for such consideration, yet it will not be an admission of other parts of the contract, which are distinct and collateral, respecting the liquidation of damages after breach of the contract. In the case of Clarke v. Gray (2), the Court of King's Bench after much consideration determined, that in an action of assumpsit against a carrier for the loss of goods, the plaintiff might maintain his action, although it was proved on the part of the defendant, that he was not to be accountable *for more than 5l.* for goods, unless entered as such and paid for accordingly, and the goods in question though above the value of 5l. had not been paid for. The court were of opinion, that the plaintiff was entitled to retain a verdict, which he had recovered for 5l., the limited amount of the damages recoverable under this contract; that this restriction was a part of the contract, *collateral* to the entire consideration and to the act to be done for that consideration, and as it related merely to the liquidation of damages after a breach of the contract, that it might be properly given in evidence to the jury in reduction of damages. It follows from this case, that if the defendant had paid money into court, he would have been allowed to give in evidence the restrictive provision, and that such evidence would not have been inconsistent with the admission of the contract stated in the declaration; * 145 though the contrary was decided in the earlier case *of Yate v. Willan (1), on the ground, that the notice containing the restriction was *a limitation of the contract*, and that

(1) Ribbans v. Cricket, 1 Bos. & Pull. 264. 2 East 134.

(2) 6 East 564.

(1) 2 East 128.

if no money had been brought into court the plaintiff must have been nonsuited. But the Court of King's Bench, adverting to this case in the before-cited case of Clarke v. Gray, said, "It appears to us, that the case of Yate v. Willan cannot be supported to its full extent; for although the payment of money in that case did admit the contract as stated in the declaration, it did not admit a contract incompatible with the restrictive provision as to the amount of damages to be recovered in case of loss." If indeed the provision is of such a nature as will discharge the defendant from *all liability under the contract*, unless the plaintiff has complied with the condition, (as was the case in Clay v. Willan (2), where the goods were not to be accounted for *to any amount*, unless properly entered and paid for,) that will not merely operate in reduction of the damages, but in bar of the action; and, therefore, in such a case, if the defendant pays money into court on a declaration against a carrier in the common form, he cannot afterwards give in evidence such a provision, which entirely negatives the contract as stated in the declaration (*a*).

Payment of money into court ought to be proved by the production of the rule of court, or by the office copy of the rule. It will not be sufficient to call the attorney, who has taken the money out of court (3).

Thirdly, as to bills of particulars.—It has been before mentioned that a bill delivered by an attorney to his client for business done during a certain period, or by a trades- Bill of particulars.

(2) 1 H. Bl. 293. 6 East 570.

(3) Israel v. Benjamin, 3 Campb. 40. As to the commencement of the practice of paying money into court, see 2 H. Bl. 376; 1 Ld. Raym. 254.

(*a*) After paying money into court, the defendant may avail himself of his infancy. *Hitchcock* v. *Tyson*, 2 *Esp. Cas.* 481. *n.*

Where in an action on a policy of insurance, the defendant paid the premium into court, it was held that the plaintiff by taking it out was not precluded from proceeding for a total loss, as he had informed the defendant's attorney at the time, of his intention to go for a total loss. *Sleght* v. *Rhinelander and others*, 1 *Johns. Rep.* 192.

man for goods sold, is strong presumptive evidence against any additional item within the same period. The party is not, however, precluded from showing that items, included in a subsequent bill, have been omitted by mistake
146 in the former *bill, and that the business which is the subject of the charge has been done by him for the defendant. A bill of particulars, delivered under a Judge's order, is more conclusive: its sole object is to inform the opposite party of what he ought to come prepared to try; and it will effectually preclude the party, who delivers it, from giving evidence of any other demand not there stated. Thus, where a declaration contained a count for money had and received for the plaintiff's use, and also a demand for horses sold by the plaintiff to the defendant himself, and the bill of particulars specified the last demand alone (1), it was decided that the plaintiff could not give evidence of horses being sold by the defendant as the plaintiff's agent; for, a contract for the absolute sale of horses to the defendant is essentially different from a contract to repay money received on a sale of horses by commission; and the proceeds of such a sale by the defendant could only be recovered under the count for money had and received, which the plaintiff abandoned by confining his bill of particulars to the demand stated in the other count. So, where the declaration contains a count on a promissory note, together with money counts, and the particular of demand includes only the note, the plaintiff will not be allowed to prove the consideration for which the note was given, and if he cannot recover upon the note on account of the want of a proper stamp, he will be nonsuited (2). And although the plaintiff, on perceiving the defect of his first particular of demand, which only mentions the promissory note, delivers a second bill of particulars large enough to comprehend the original debt, yet this will not avail him, unless the second particular has been

(1) Holland v. Hopkins, 2 Bos. & Pull. 243.

(2) Wade v. Beasley, 4 Esp. N. P. C. 7.

delivered under a Judge's order (3). On the other hand, if the plaintiff, either before or after delivering a bill of particulars under a Judge's order, makes a demand of payment only for a part of the articles specified in the bill, such a demand *will not have the effect of confining him in his evidence, nor supersede the bill of particulars (1). If the plaintiff in the former case could have recovered on the promissory note, he might have recovered interest also, as arising out of the principal, and incident to it, though interest has not been specifically claimed in the particular of demand which gives notice of the amount of the note (2). * 147

In an action of assumpsit, where the defendant pleaded in abatement, that the promises were made by himself and another person jointly, on which plea issue was joined, and on the trial it appeared from the bill of particulars that some of the articles had been furnished to the defendant jointly with the person named in the plea, Lord Kenyon, C. J. held that the plaintiff was bound by his bill of particulars, which supported the defendant's plea; and, therefore, he nonsuited the plaintiff (3). Here the articles stated to have been furnished on the joint credit of the defendant and another person, were items of the plaintiff's demand; and a *necessary* part of his bill of particulars, if he intended to recover payment upon them against the defendant. And this seems to distinguish the case from that of Miller v. Johnson (4), which was an action for the sale of some lottery tickets, and as proof of the sale the particular of the defendant's set-off was produced, which mentioned the fact of the sale of the tickets to himself: but Ch. J. Eyre, who tried the cause, was of opinion that the particular could not properly be used against the defendant for this purpose, and that the fact of sale ought to be proved by other evidence.

(3) Brown v. Watts, 1 Taunt. 353.

(1) Short v. Edwards, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 373.

(2) Blake v. Lawrence, 4 Esp. N. P. C. 147.

(3) Colson v. Selby, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 451. A rule to set aside the nonsuit was afterwards refused by the court.

(4) 2 Esp. N. P. C. 602.

The use of a bill of particulars is to prevent the inconveniences which might otherwise arise from the general
* 148 and *undefined statements in the plaintiff's declaration, and to apprise the defendant of the particulars of the demand which the plaintiff has against him. If it gives sufficient information to the opposite party to guard him against surprise, it answers the purpose for which it was intended, and will be sufficient, though it may be in some respects inaccurate. Thus in an action of assumpsit for money paid to the defendant's use, where in the bill of particulars an item for money advanced was by mistake written under the name of A. B. instead of being written under that of C. D. in another part of the particular, and thus appeared to have been advanced to the former. Lord Ellenborough allowed the plaintiff to prove that the item in question was intended and must have been understood to refer to the latter name, but by mere clerical error had been misplaced; and that if the defendant could show by affidavit that he had been misled by the plaintiff's particular, it might furnish a ground for the court afterwards to set aside that particular sum (1). So, where the work, for which the action was brought, was stated by the particular to have been done in a wrong month, when in fact no work had been done, the plaintiff was allowed to give evidence of his having done work for the defendant in the other month (2). And although the general rule is, that the party shall be confined to his own bill of particulars, and not admitted to give evidence of any additional demand, yet under certain circumstances, in a case where the proofs produced by the defendant himself established another claim in his favour, the plaintiff has been allowed to have the benefit of such evidence even beyond the contents of the particular. Thus, where an action was brought by one partner against another to recover a balance due on a statement of accounts, the plaintiff by his bill of particulars confined himself to the balance due on the *separate*

(1) Day v. Bower, 1 Campb. 69. (2) Millwood v. Walter, 2 Taunt. n. 224.

accounts, in support of which he gave in evidence an account by the defendant, making himself debtor to a *certain amount; and in answer to this evidence the defendant produced an account subsequently rendered by the plaintiff, according to which there appeared to be a balance due on the *separate* accounts to the defendant; but on the opposite side of the page, there was a statement also of the *partnership* accounts, on which the balance was in favour of the plaintiff and greatly exceeded the balance on the *separate* account. It was objected that the plaintiff could not recover beyond his particular; the court, however, said, that the defendant himself had given the plaintiff a better case than he was at liberty to make for himself, and that the plaintiff was entitled to a verdict for all that had been proved to be due to him (1). The parties afterwards came to a compromise, and agreed upon the sum to be recovered. It is to be observed, that there were peculiar circumstances in this case; the written paper, which the defendant gave in evidence as the writing of the plaintiff, could only have been admitted as one entire writing, the whole to be taken together, and was not admissible merely in parts; the defendant could not use in evidence the *separate* account of the plaintiff without admitting also the *partnership* account, which was written by him on the same paper, since the one part might have explained or referred to the other, and if the statement of a party is given in evidence against himself, the *whole* of the statement ought to be received, though all its parts may not deserve the same credit. But it appears to be too much to infer generally from the authority of this case, that because the evidence adduced by the defendant shows, there were other items which might have been included in the bill of particulars, the plaintiff ought, therefore, to recover on these items, as well as upon those which are specifically mentioned. The case in question must be considered as a particular exception, and not as establishing a rule of so

* 149

(1) Hurst v. Watkis, 1 Campb. 68.

wide and general a nature. The plaintiff, it is presumed,
* 150 can neither cross examine the defendant's *witnesses to any claim, which he has not comprehended in his particular of demand, nor can he at the trial avail himself of any such claim, though disclosed by the witnesses on the other side in their examination in chief.

Sect. IV.

The Affirmative of the Issue is to be proved.

The next rule is, that the point in issue is to be proved by the party who asserts the affirmative; according to the maxim of the civil law, "ei incumbit probatio, qui dicit, non qui negat." Thus, in an action for a loss by barratry in the master of a ship, where it was objected by the defendant, that the plaintiff ought to prove that the master was not also the owner or freighter, and that he did not act under the direction of the person who was, in which case barratry could not be committed, the court held, that if the master was owner or freighter, or acted under the direction of the owner, the burden of proving that fact lay on the defendant (1). In an action on the game laws, though the plaintiff must aver, in order to bring the defendant within the act, that he was not duly qualified; yet it is not necessary to disprove his qualifications; but it will be for the defendant, if he can, to prove himself qualified (2). And there appears to be no good reason, why the same rule of evidence should not be adopted in proceedings on convictions before magistrates, as well as in an action for penalties. A distinction has, however, been made; and some of the Judges have been of opinion, that on such proceedings, some evidence of the want of quali-

(1) Ross v. Hunter, 4 T. R. 33. 38.

(2) By Lord Mansfield, in Spieres v. Parker, 1 T. R. 144; Buller, J. in 1 T. R. 649: Heath, J. in Jelfs v. Ballard, 1 Bos. & Pull. 468; Chambre, J. in Frontine v. Frost, 2 Bos. & Pull. 307; adm. per Cur. in R. v. Stone, 1 East 650.

fication ought to be produced (3). But it is admitted, that *only *general* evidence of this negative fact can be necessary (1). * 151

Where one party charges another with a culpable omission or breach of duty, the general rule above laid down does not apply. In such a case, the person who makes the charge is bound to prove it, though it may involve a negative; for it is one of the first principles of justice, not to presume that a person has acted illegally, till the contrary is proved (*a*). Thus, in a suit for tithes in the Spiritual Court, where the defendant pleaded, that the plaintiff had not read the thirty-nine articles, the Court put the defendant to prove the fact, though a negative; upon which, he moved the Court of King's Bench for a prohibition; but it was refused, for the reason already stated (2). So, in an action by the owner of a ship against the defendants, for putting on board a quantity of combustible and dangerous articles "without giving due notice thereof," the Court held, that it lay upon the plaintiff to prove this negative averment (3). So, on an indictment on the statute 42 G. 3. c. 107. s. 1., which makes it felony to course deer on an enclosed ground *without the consent of the owner*, the negative ought to be proved, that the owner had not given his consent (4) (*b*).

John 19. 34

(3) R. v. Jarvis, 1 Burr. 148. 153; 1 East 643. (c) S. C. By Lord Kenyon and Grose, J. in R. v. Stone, 1 East 649; and Chambre, J. in 3 Bos. & Pull. 307. And see R. v. Marriott, 1 Str. 66; Bluet q. t. v. Needs, Com. Rep. 522. 5.—Contra Lawrence, J. and Le Blanc, J. 1 East 653.

(1) R. v. Crowther, 1 T. R. 125.

(2) Monke v. Butler, 1 Roll. Rep. 83. cited by Lord Ellenborough, 3 East 199; Powell v. Milbank, 2 Black. Rep. 851., S. P. See also Lord Halifax's case, Bull. N. P. [298]. R. v. Combs, Comb. 57.

(3) Williams v. E. Ind. Comp. 3 East 193. 9.

(4) R. v. Rogers, 2 Campb. 654.

(*a*) Vide 10 *East* 216.

(*b*) In all cases where the act of a party is sought to be avoided on the ground of his mental imbecility, the proof of the fact lies upon him who alleges it, and until the contrary appears, sanity is to be presumed. *Jackson d. Van Dusen & others* v. *Van Dusen*, 5 *Johns. Rep.* 144. *Contra, Phelps* v. *Hartwell*, 1 *Mass. Rep.* 71.

It is a general rule of evidence, that the burden of proof lies on the person who has to support his case by proof of a fact, of which he is supposed to be cognizant. Thus, in an action by the assignees of a bankrupt, where the defendant, under a notice of set-off, gave in evidence promissory notes dated before the bankruptcy, the Court held that he ought also to show, that the notes came to his hands before that time (5). So where the question is on *the legitimacy of a child, if a legal marriage is proved, the legitimacy is presumed, and the party who asserts the illegitimacy ought to prove it (1): But if there has been a divorce *a mensa et thoro*, the presumption is, that a child born afterwards, (as a year after the sentence, &c.) is illegitimate (2); it will be sufficient therefore in such a case to prove the divorce; and this will call upon the opposite party to establish the legitimacy by proof of access. So where the issue is upon the life or death of a person, the proof of the fact lies upon the party who asserts the death, for the presumption is that the party continues alive, until the contrary be proved (3). But where no account can be given of the person, this presumption of the duration of life ceases at the expiration of seven years from the time when he was last known to be living (4); a period, which has been fixed, from analogy to the statute of bigamy (5) (*a*), and the statute concerning leases determinable on lives (6)*.

*152

(5) Dickson v. Evans, 6 T. R. 57.
(1) See ante, p. 112.
(2) Parishes of St. George and St. Margaret, 1 Salk. 123. See ante, p. 113.
(3) Wilson v. Hodges, 2 East 312.
(4) Doe dem. George v. Jesson, 6 East 80, 85.
(5) St. 1 J. 1. c. 11. s. 2.
(6) St. 19. C. 2. c. 6.

* The statute of bigamy contains a proviso, that "it shall not extend to any person, whose husband or wife shall be continually remaining beyond the seas by the space of seven years together, or whose husband or wife

(*a*) By the stat. sess. 11. c. 24. Laws of New-York, 1 R. L. 113. the period is reduced to five years, instead of seven, as in the English statute; but the space of seven years is adopted in the act for the more effectual discovery of the death of persons, upon whose lives estates do depend. Sess. 11. c. 10. 1 R. L. 103.

Thus in the case of Doe v. Jesson, where it was proved that a person went to sea at a particular time, which was the last account given of him, his death was presumed at the end of seven years from that time. And therefore, where the defendant pleaded coverture in bar of an action of assumpsit, and proved her marriage, and that her husband went abroad twelve years before the commencement *of the action, this was held not to be sufficient, and the defendant was required to prove that her husband was alive within seven years (1) : without such additional proof, the jury might have presumed the *death* of the husband at the time of the promise, which would have been against the defendant's plea (*a*). * 153

Although, in general, it is necessary for a party, who brings an action, to prove all the material facts which he alleges in support of his claim, yet where the defendant

(1) Hopwell v. De Pinna, 2 Campb. 113.

shall absent him or herself the one from the other by the space of seven years together within the king's dominions, the one of them not knowing the other to be living within that time." It has been held, that the last clause, (namely, "the one of them not knowing," &c.) relates only to the 2d clause, and not to the *first* respecting commorancy beyond the seas; and consequently that the second marriage is not felonious, where either of the parties is beyond the seas for seven years, though the party in this country had notice that the other was living. 3 Inst. 88. 1 Hale P. C. 692. 4 Bl. Com. 164.

(*a*) So, although the proof of the fact of loss lies upon the insured, yet, where the vessel has not been heard of for a length of time, it will be presumed that she foundered at sea. There is no general rule established as to the period after which the presumption may be made, but each case must depend on its peculiar circumstances; and all that it is incumbent on the insured to show is, the time when the vessel sailed on the voyage insured, and that she had never been heard of at the port of destination. 2 *Marsh.* 488, 489, 490. *Green* v. *Brown*, 2 *Str.* 1199. *Newby* v. *Read*, *Park* 63. *Cohen* v. *Hinckly*, 2 *Campb.* 51. *Twemlow & others* v. *Oswin*, *Id.* 85. *Brown* v. *Neilson*, 1 *Caines' Rep.* 525. *Gorden* v. *Bowne*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 150.

pleads a fact within his own knowledge in discharge of himself, and the plaintiff still insists on the defendant's liability, alleging the same fact in his replication, there the burden of the proof lies on the defendant, not upon the plaintiff. Thus, in an action of assumpsit, where the defendant pleaded infancy, and the plaintiff replied, that "the defendant, after he had attained his full age, ratified and confirmed the promise and undertaking," the Court held, that the mere proof of a promise to pay was sufficient on the part of the plaintiff; and that it was for the defendant to prove the personal incapacity to contract, on which he grounded his defence, and which lay so peculiarly within his own knowledge (2).

Sect. V.

The Substance only of the Issue need be proved.

The next rule to be considered is, that, on any issue, it will be sufficient to prove the substance of the issue. Thus where the defendant pleaded payment of the principal sum and of all interest due, and it appeared in evidence that a gross sum was paid, not amounting to the full interest, but accepted by the plaintiff as full payment, the Lord Ch. Justice Raymond held the proof to be sufficient (3) (*b*).
* 154 So, *in an action upon a special promise to deliver up a bond on the payment of a sum of money, which had been borrowed of the defendant; the evidence for the plaintiff was, that the money had been tendered to the defendant, and the bond had been demanded, but refused: and, an objection being made on the part of the defendant, that the

(2) Borthwick v. Carruthers, 1 T. R. 648.

(3) Price v. Brown, 2 Str. 690.

(*b*) So, in debt on bond, receipt of a sum smaller than the amount of the condition and an acknowledgment of full satisfaction, are good evidence on a plea of payment. *Henderson* v. *Moore*, 5 *Cranch* 11.

plaintiff's case had not been proved as laid, Lee, Ch. J. overruled it; and the Court of Common Pleas, after taking time to consider, were unanimously of opinion, that the evidence was sufficient to support the declaration: as the tender on the one side, and the refusal to accept on the other, were in point of law equivalent to payment (1).

In an action of waste for cutting down a certain number of trees, proof that the defendant cut a smaller number is sufficient; for, in effect, the issue is waste or no waste (2). So, in an action against a sheriff, where the plaintiff declared, that he had J. S. and his wife in execution, and that the defendant suffered them to escape, and a special verdict was found, that the husband alone was taken in execution, (the execution being for a debt due from the wife before coverture,) and that he escaped, the Court held that the substance of the issue was found, and gave judgment for the plaintiff (3) (*a*). In an action on a simple contract, whether assumpsit or debt, the plaintiff may prove and recover a less sum than he has demanded in the writ; and for this reason, it has been held, that a declaration in such action is not bad for specifying a less sum, though the breach assigned is the nonpayment of the whole sum demanded (4).

In actions for slander, the courts used at one time to hold, that the plaintiff was bound to prove the words precisely as laid; but it is now settled, that it will be sufficient, *if the plaintiff prove the substance of the words (*b*). And * 155

(1) Alcorn v. Westbrook, 1 Wils. 115; Wright, J., at first *contra*.

(2) Co. Lit. 282. a. 2 Roll. Ab. 706. tit. Verdict, C., Art. 40.

(3) Roberts and Wife v. Herbert, 1 Sid. 5. S. C. cited Bull. N. P. 299.

(4) M'Quillin v. Cox, 1 H. Bl. 249.

(*a*) In debt against a sheriff, under a count for a voluntary escape, the plaintiff may give evidence of a negligent escape. *Bonafous* v. *Walker*, 2 *Term Rep.* 126.

(*b*) So, it has been held, that a declaration charging that the defendant spoke certain words, *in substance as follows*—was good. *Kennedy* v. *Lowry*, 1 *Binney* 393.

if the declaration contain several actionable words, the plaintiff will be entitled to a verdict on proving some of them (1). In the late case of Hall v. Smith (2), where the declaration stated, that the plaintiff was a trader at C. and also a trader at O., and that the defendant spoke concerning the plaintiff *as such trader, that he was a bankrupt at C.*, &c., it was proved at the trial, that the plaintiff carried on a trade at O., but not that he carried on the other trade at C. as stated, and the words spoken of him were, *that he was a bankrupt at C. in the liquor trade*, (which was the trade carried on at O.), the court held, that the substance of the charge had been proved, and that the place where the plaintiff was stated to have become a bankrupt was immaterial (*b*).

(1) Compagnon v. Martin, 2 Bl. Rep. 790.

(2) 1 Maul. & Sel. 287.

(*b*) The sense as well as manner of speaking the words must be the same: therefore, where the words were laid in the third person, "He deserves to be hanged for a note he forged on A.; proof that the words were used in the second person, "*You* deserve," &c. was held not to support the declaration; for there is a difference between words spoken in a passion to a man's face, and spoken deliberately behind his back, the first being more excusable. *Avarillo* v. *Rogers*, *Bull. N. P.* 5. 2 *Esp. Dig.* 23. 8 *Johns. Rep.* 75. *Contra*, *Tracy* v. *Harkins*, 1 *Binney* 395. *n.* So, words laid affirmatively are not supported by proof of words spoken interrogatively: as where the words laid were, "he cannot pay his labourers;" evidence that the defendant had asked a witness, "if he had heard Barnes could not pay his labourers," was held not to support the declaration. *Barnes* v. *Holloway*, 8 *Term Rep.* 150. So, in an indictment the words were laid to have been spoken *of* a justice of the peace in the execution of his office; at the trial the words were proved to have been spoken *to* the justice, and judgment was, therefore, given for the defendant. *The King* v. *Berry*, 4 *Term Rep.* 217. If the words laid are, that the plaintiff stole the goods of A., proof of the defendant's saying, that the plaintiff stole the goods of B., would not support the declaration; because, although stealing the goods of B. is an indictable offence,

In an action of replevin, where the defendant avowed taking the cattle as damage-feasant, the plaintiff pleaded in bar, that one W. was seized of a house and land, &c. whereto he had common, &c. and demised the same to him to hold *from* a certain day next before for a year, the avowant traversed the lease *modo et forma*, upon which issue was taken; the jury found a special verdict, that W. made a lease to the plaintiff *on* the day stated for a year; and the plaintiff had judgment, for although this is not the same lease as pleaded, (since this begins on the day and the other not so soon), yet, the court said, the substance of the issue is, whether or not the plaintiff had such a lease, as by force thereof he might have common at the time, and this appeared to be the case here (3). But, the court added, it (the verdict) must not depart altogether from the form of the issue; for if it had been found that he had right of common by a lease from another, or as an owner, that had been clearly out of the issue both in matter and form. And they admitted, that if the plaintiff had declared *thus in *ejectione firmæ*, it would have been clearly against him, for there he *demands* and recovers the *term*, and therefore must make his title truly. In the principal case, as the reporter observes, the jury might have found directly against the plaintiff *non dimisit modo et forma*, and could not safely have found a general verdict for him; but, the jury having found specially, the court gave judgment for the plaintiff (1). * 156

(3) Pope v. Skinner, Hob. 72. S. C. cited, Bull. N. P. 300.

(1) S. C. cited as to this point, Com. Dig. tit. Pleader, S. 7.

---

yet it is a different offence from stealing the goods of A. So, when the defendant says, that the plaintiff with B., C. and D. conspired, &c., it is not enough to prove that he said, the plaintiff, together with B. and C. conspired, &c.; because, although it may be indictable for the plaintiff to conspire with B. & C., yet it is a different offence from his conspiring with B., C. & D.; he may have been guilty of both, and punishable for both. *Johnston* v. *Tate*, 6 *Binney* 121.

In replevin, if the defendant avow taking the cattle as damage-feasant, and the plaintiff justify for common, and aver that the cattle were levant and couchant, on which issue is joined, proof only for *part of the cattle* is not sufficient, for the issue is upon the whole (2). So, if the issue joined between the parties were, whether A. and B. were churchwardens, proof, that one was and not the other, would not be sufficient (3). So, where the declaration averred, that the plaintiff was constable of a *particular parish*, and that he was assaulted in the execution of his office as constable, and it appeared on the evidence, that he had been sworn in to serve for a whole liberty, of which the parish formed a part, this was held to be a material variance (4).

On a charge of petit treason, if the killing with malice is proved, but no circumstances of aggravation are proved to make the offence treasonable, the prisoner may be found guilty of the murder. So, on an indictment for burglary and stealing goods, if it appear that no burglary was committed, as where the breaking and entering were not in the night, the prisoner may be found guilty only of the simple
* 157 larceny (5); so, on a charge of robbery, where the *property was not taken from the person by violence or by putting him in fear (*a*). So, on the trial of an indictment for murder, the jury may find the prisoner guilty of manslaughter only; for the principal matter is the killing, and the malice is only a circumstance in aggravation (1). And

(2) Sloper v. Allen, 2 Roll. Ab. 706. tit. Trial, C. 41. S. C. cited Bull. N. P. 299. See also Coney v. Verden, cited from MS. in 1 Selw. N. P. 393; Griffin v. Blandford, Cowp. 62; Brook v. Willett, 2 H. Bl. 224; 1 Campb. 314, 5; as to variances in the proof of a prescription or custom.

(3) Bull. N. P. 299.

(4) Goodes v. Wheatly, 1 Campb. N. P. C. 231.

(5) 2 East P. C. 513.

(1) Mackalley's case, 9 Rep. 67. b. Co. Lit. 282. a. Gilb. Ev. 233.

(*a*) So, on an indictment for a forcible entry and detainer, the jury may find the defendant guilty of the detainer only. *The People* v. *Anthony*, 4 *Johns. Rep.* 198.

if the manner or means of the death proved agree in substance with the means charged in the indictment, it will be sufficient; as, where the indictment is for killing with a dagger, and the evidence prove a killing with a staff (2); so, if the indictment be for killing with one sort of poison, and the evidence proves the killing with another, such evidence maintains the indictment, because the proof of the instrument is not absolutely necessary to the proof of the fact itself (2); but if the charge is for poisoning, and the death is proved to have been caused by striking or starving, &c., this evidence would not support the indictment as the species of death in the one case is totally different from that in the other (3).

So, if the indictment charges that A. gave the mortal blow, and that B. and C. were present abetting, &c., but on the evidence it appears that B. struck, and that A. and C. were present, &c., this is not a material variance, for the stroke is adjudged in law to be the stroke of every one of them, and is as strongly the act of the others, as if they all three had held the weapon, and had altogether struck the deceased (4). But if two persons are indicted as principals, and one is proved to be only accessary, he must be discharged on this indictment (5). So, one indicted as accessary before cannot be convicted upon evidence proving him to have been (principal in the second degree) present aiding and abetting at the fact (6). In Mackalley's case (7), where the prisoner was tried for the murder of a *sergeant at mace in London, the indictment charged, that the sheriff made a precept to the sergeant for the arrest, and it appeared upon the evidence that there was no such precept, but that the sergeant made the arrest ex officio at the plaintiff's request on the entry of the plaint, according to the custom of the city; and all the judges held, that the * 158

(2) 9 Rep. 67. a. Gilb. Ev. 231. 1 East P. C. 341.
(3) Ib. and 2 Inst. 319.
(4) Mackalley's case, 9 Rep. 67. b. 4 Rep. 42. b. Wallis's case, 1 Salk. 334.
(5) Gilb. Ev. 233.
(6) Gordon's case, 1 East P. C. 352.
(7) 9 Rep. 61. b. 67. a. 68. a.

variance between the indictment and the evidence was not material, because the warrant to arrest was only a circumstance, and the substance of the matter had been found, which was, that the prisoner killed an officer in the lawful execution of legal process. The judges were also of opinion, that the indictment might have been general, (that the prisoner feloniously and of his malice prepense killed, &c.) and that the special matter might have been given in evidence; and since the indictment in the principal case contained such an averment, they held that the charge of murder had been proved, notwithstanding that the special matter given in evidence might vary in substance from the special matter contained in the indictment (*a*).

Averments when immaterial.

A great variety of cases occur in the books with respect to the necessity of proving averments in pleadings. Immaterial averments need not be proved; but because an averment might have been unnecessary, it will not, therefore, follow that it is immaterial (1). The general rule on this subject is, that if the whole of an averment may be struck out without destroying the plaintiff's right of action, it will not be necessary to prove it; but it is otherwise, if the whole cannot be struck out without getting rid of a part essential to the cause of action; for then, though the averment be more particular than it need have been, the whole must be proved, or the plaintiff cannot recover (2). Thus in the case of Bristow v. Wright (3), which was an action against the sheriff for taking the lodger's goods without
* 159 *leaving a year's rent, the declaration stated some particu-

(1) 1 Maul. & Sel. 204. Crawley v. Blewett, 12 Mod. 127. Savage q. t. v. Smith, 2 Blac. Rep. 1191. Turner v. Eyles, 3 Bos. & Pull. 456.

(2) By Lawrence, J. in Williamson v. Allison, 2 East 452.

(3) 2 Doug. 664. See 5 T. R. 496; 2 East 450, 2; 8 East 9.

(*a*) An indictment for high treason, stated to have been committed by a certain number of persons, among whom was the defendant, is supported by proving that it was committed by a less number. *The United States* v. *Vigol*, 2 *Dall.* 346.

lars of the demise relative to the time of payment of rent which were negatived by the evidence, and the Court held that the variance was fatal. There, it was necessary for the plaintiff, in order to show that he was landlord, to set forth a contract between himself and the tenant, and no part of the contract alleged could be struck out, because it was in its nature entire, though it was admitted that the part of the contract relating to the time of payment need not have been averred. And the case of Williamson v. Allison (1), illustrates the other part of the rule, namely, that where an averment may be struck out, it need not be proved. That was an action on the case in tort for the breach of a warranty in selling goods unfit for sale, and the declaration averred, that the defendant knew the goods to be in an unfit state, of which fact there was no evidence at the trial, but the Court held that such proof was unnecessary, for if the whole averment respecting the defendant's knowledge of the unfitness for sale were struck out, the declaration would still be sufficient to entitle the plaintiff to recover upon the breach of the warranty proved (*a*).

The same rule is applicable to averments in an indictment. If an averment may be entirely omitted, without affecting the charge against the prisoner and without detriment to the indictment, it will be considered as surplusage, and may be disregarded in evidence. Thus, where the prisoner was charged with a robbery *near the highway*, and the robbery was proved, but not near the highway (2), so, where the robbery was averred to have been committed in the *house of a certain person* named, and the name of the owner was not proved (3), so, where the offence of arson was stated in the indictment to have been committed in the *night-time*, and was proved not to have been in the night-

(1) 2 East 446. See also Peppin v. Solomon, 5 T. R. 496.

(2) Wardle's case, 2 East P. C. 785.

(3) Pye's case, Johnstone's case, ib.

(*a*) Vide *Wilson* v. *Codman's Exr.* 3 *Cranch* 193. *Livingston et al.* v. *Swanwick*, 2 *Dall.* 300. *Peter* v. *Gocke*, 1 *Wash.* 257.

time (4); in these cases, all the judges were of opinion, that
* 160 *the convictions were proper, and the prisoners were ousted of the benefit of clergy. But where the averment in the indictment is sensible and material, it ought to be regularly proved; as, where the prisoner was indicted for a burglary in the house of J. D. *with intent to steal the goods of J. W.*, and it appeared in evidence that no such person had any goods in the house, but that the name of J. W. was put by mistake for J. D. (1), the judges held, that it was material to state truly the property of the goods, and on account of this variance the prisoner was acquitted (*a*).

Variance in proof of *contract.*

Where the action is brought upon a *contract*, the contract ought to be stated correctly, and proved as laid (*b*); and if any part of the contract proved vary materially from that stated in the pleadings, the whole foundation of the action fails, since the contract is entire and indivisible (2). If the contract, therefore, for the breach of which the action is brought, was in the alternative at the option of the defendant, (as to deliver *such or such* a quantity of goods at one time, and the remainder at another,) it ought to be so stated, for if the declaration states an absolute contract,

(4) Minton's case, 2 East P. C. 1021.

(1) Jenk's case, 2 East P. C. 514.

(2) 1 T. R. 240; 3 T. R. 645. See Bristow v. Wright, 2 Doug. 664., (supra, p. 158., S. C.;) Carlisle v. Trears, Cowp. 671; Durston v. Tuthan, cited 3 T. R. 67; Littler v. Holland, 3 T. R. 590; Hockin v. Cooke, 4 T. R. 314; Leery v. Goodson, 4 T. R. 687; White v. Wilson, 2 Bos. & Pul. 116; Penny v. Porter, 2 East 2; Weall v. King, 12 East 452; Brown v. Sayce, 4 Taunt. 320; Pool v. Court, 4 Taunt. 700; Cohen v. Hannam, 5 Taunt. 101. See also Whitwell v. Bennet, 3 Bos. & Pul. 559., Gordon v. Austin, 4 T. R. 611., Roche v. Campbell, 3 Camp. N. P. C. 247. Hodge v. Fillis, 3 Campb. 463., which are cases on promissory notes or bills of exchange.

(*a*) In an indictment for stopping the mail, a contract with the post-master general to transport the mail was alleged, and it was held that the contract must be proved, although the indictment might have been good without such an allegation. *United States* v. *Porter*, 3 *Day* 283.

(*b*) It is sufficient to declare upon a written contract according to its legal effect and import, and not in its precise words. *Lent* v. *Padelford*, 10 *Mass. Rep.* 230. 1 *Chitty on Plead.* 298, 299.

and the proof is of a contract in the alternative, the plaintiff cannot recover, although the defendant may have determined his option (3). It will not be necessary for the plaintiff to state all the several parts of a contract, which consists of distinct and collateral provisions; but it is sufficient to state so much of the contract, as contains the entire consideration for the act and the entire act to be done in virtue of such consideration, including the time, *manner, and other circumstances of its performance (1). * 161
Thus, if there is a provision in the contract to discharge the party from all liability, in case a particular condition is not complied with, it ought to be set out and strictly proved; but it is otherwise, where the provision respects only the liquidation of damages on a breach of the contract; such a provision need not be stated in the pleadings (1). So, in an action on the case upon the warranty of a horse, if the plaintiff states truly the whole of the consideration for the promise of the defendant, (which, in the case referred to, was the redelivery of the horse to the defendant,) and then states truly the substantive parts of the warranty, of the breach of which he complains, this will be sufficient, without averring other parts of the warranty, which are entirely collateral and irrelevant to those stated (2). In the late case of Gladstone v. Neal (3), the contract stated was for the purchase of a certain quantity of goods, ("to wit, eight tons,") and the contract proved was for the purchase of "*about* 8 tons," the exact amount not being known at the time of making the contract, but being ascertained before the action was brought; and it was determined at the trial, and afterwards by the Court of King's Bench, that the variance was not material (*a*).

(3) Penny v. Porter, 2 East 2; and see 2 East 134; Cooke v. Munstone, 1 Bos. &. Pul. N. R. 351.

(1) Clarke v. Gray, 6 East 564, 9; and see supra, p. 144., S. C.
(2) Miles v. Sheward, 8 East 7.
(3) 13 East 410.

(*a*) Where the plaintiff declared on a contract by which the defendant agreed to pay him a certain sum, for *half* the land taken for a certain road; and the contract proved at the trial was, that

In all cases of joint contracts, in writing or by parol, or *ex quasi contractu*, and in all cases of joint obligations, it seems now to be settled, that, if one only be sued, he must plead the matter in abatement, and cannot take advantage

---

the defendant was to pay for *all* the land, the variance was held fatal. *Crawford & others* v. *Morrell*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 253. Where the declaration alleged an undertaking in consideration of a contract entered into by the plaintiff to *build* a ship, and the evidence was of a contract to *finish* a ship partly built, it was held that the variance was fatal. *Smith* v. *Barker*, 3 *Day* 312. Where the plaintiff covenanted to build a mill in a certain place, and by a certain time, and in an action of covenant averred that he erected the mill at the place, and by the time mentioned in the agreement; it was held that parol evidence that the mill was erected at a different place. and after the time, by the consent and agreement of the defendant, did not support the declaration. *Philips & Butler* v. *Rose*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 392. In an action against two or more persons, on a promissory note with a joint name or firm, if the declaration contains no averment that the defendants were partners or acted under the firm, but that the defendants *made the note in their own proper hands and names thereunto subscribed*, proof that one of the defendants subscribed the note is not sufficient to prove the contract as laid. *Pease & another* v. *Morgan*, 7 *Johns. Rep.* 468. In an action *qui tam* for usury, the plaintiff alleged a loan by the defendant to A. for *sixty-three* days, and produced a note in evidence payable to the defendant in *sixty* days, this was held a fatal variance, although the three days of grace added to the number of days specified in the note would make sixty-three days. *Wilmot* v. *Monson*, 4 *Day* 114. See on the subject of variance generally: —*Jerome* v. *Whitney*, 7 *Johns. Rep.* 321. *Lansing* v. *M'Killip*, 3 *Caines' Rep.* 286. *Whitlock* v. *Ramsey's Admx.* 2 *Mun.* 510. *Drake* v. *Watson*, 4 *Day* 37. *Drummond* v. *Crutcher*, 2 *Wash.* 218. *De Forest* v. *Brainerd*, 2 *Day* 528. *Beers* v. *Botsford*, 3 *Day* 159. *Franklin & others* v. *Talmadge*, 5 *Johns. Rep.* 84. *The People* v. *Runkel*, 9 *Johns. Rep.* 147. *Evans* v. *Smith*, 1 *Wash.* 72. *M'Williams* v. *Willis*, *Id.* 199. *Baylies & another* v. *Fettyplace & another*, 7 *Mass. Rep.* 325.

A variance in a plea as well as in a declaration, between the contract as laid, and the contract as proved, is fatal: and it is equal-

of it afterwards upon any other plea or in arrest of judgment, or give it in evidence. Thus in an action against the defendant as drawer of a bill of exchange, who pleaded non assumpsit, and it appeared in evidence at the trial, that the bill was drawn by the defendant and another jointly; on a motion to set aside the verdict, (which had been found for the plaintiff,) upon the ground of this supposed *variance, the Court of Exchequer were clearly of opinion, that there was no variance between the bill of exchange proved and that which was declared upon (1). The same rule holds, when the action is brought against one of several partners; the defendant must plead in abatement, and cannot give the partnership in evidence under the general issue (2). Formerly, a different rule was adopted, on the ground of a supposed variance (3). But with respect to the *party suing*, the rule is still the same; namely, that if an action of assumpsit is brought by one only of several persons, who ought to join, the defendant may take advantage of it upon non-assumpsit (4) (*a*).

* 162

Variance in proof of *deed.*

Where a *deed* is declared upon, and it appears on comparing and reading the record with the instrument produced, that some of the words stated in the pleadings as descriptive of the deed, (and which cannot be rejected as surplusage,) vary from the deed, the variance will be fatal (5);

(1) Evans v. Lewis, 1794., MS. case, reported in Mr. Serjt. William's edit. of Saund. 1 V. 291. d. See also Germain v. Frederick, MS. case, id. and Cowp. 832.

(2) Rice v. Shute, 5 Burr. 2611. Abbott v. Smith, 2 Black. 947.

(3) Boson v. Sandford, 2 Salk. 440.

(4) 2 Str. 820. Graham v. Robertson, 2 T. R. 282, and see 1 Saund. 291. f. note.

(5) Pitt v. Green, 9 East 188; Bowditch v. Mawley, 1 Campb. 195.

---

ly so, though the contract in either case would be usurious. The rule even requires the contract to be more precisely stated in a plea of usury, in bar, than in a declaration in a qui tam suit, because the facts are within the defendant's knowledge. *Lawrence* v. *Knies*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 140. As to variance in pleading an usurious contract, vide *Tate* v. *Wellings*, 3 *Term Rep.* 531. *Smith* v. *Brush*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 84.

(*a*) Vide ante, 127.

and though some parts of the deed, which the declaration purports to set out at length, need not have been stated at all, or might have been stated shortly according to their legal effect and operation (6), yet if they are set out at length, they ought to be proved as laid, and in case of a variance the plaintiff must fail (*b*).

Variance in proof of *record.*

A similar rule has been laid down, where a *record* is referred to in the pleadings. If the allegation is descriptive of the record, it ought to be strictly and literally proved as laid (*c*). Thus, in the case of Green v. Rennett (7), where a writ was described in terms, when sued out and when re-
* 163 *turnable, and on the production of the writ itself it appeared to be returnable on a different day from that stated in the declaration, the court held that the variance was fatal, though the day of the return was laid under a *videlicet.

(6) Dundass v. Lord Weymouth, Cowp. 665; Price v. Fletcher, Cowp. 727; Roulston v. Clarke, 2 H. Bl. 563.

(7) 1 T. R. 656; 9 East 161. 163.

Brown v. Jacobs, 2 Esp. N. P. C. 726. R. v. Taylor, 1 Campb. N. P. C. 404. See also Com. Dig. tit. Record, (C), (D).

Effect of videlicet.

* Where the circumstance averred in the pleadings, (as of a particular sum or day), is material, the addition of a *videlicet* will not render the averment immaterial, (Grimwood v. Barrit, 6 T. R. 460, 3); though the omission of a videlicet may *in some cases* make an averment material, which would not otherwise be so (Symmons v. Knox, 3 T. R. 65, 8.) If, therefore, the day laid in the declaration be material, it must be proved, notwith-

---

(*b*) Thus a mistake in declaring in a lease, of the name of a person stated in the demise as late tenant of the premises is fatal. *Bowditch* v. *Mawley*, 1 *Campb.* 195. So a variance in the date of a bond or in the sum is fatal. *Gordon & others* v. *Browne's Exr.* 3 *Hen. & Mun.* 219. *Adams* v. *Spear*, 1 *Hayw.* 215. So, in an indictment for forging a deed, a variance in the courses, as *twenty* instead of *twenty-two*, is material. *State* v. *Street*, *Tayl.* 128.

In like manner, where a note not negotiable, was declared upon as being *for value received*, which words were not contained in the note produced in evidence, it was held that they were descriptive of the note, and that therefore the variance was fatal. *Saxton & Hutcheson* v. *Johnson*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 418.

(*c*) Vide *Thompson* v. *Jameson*, 1 *Cranch* 282.

The return-day was material in that case, because it was part of the description of the writ stated, which could only be proved by a writ returnable on the same day. But where the pleadings do not undertake to set out the tenour of the record, and the substance only of the record is stated, there a variance between the allegation and the record will not be fatal, and it will be sufficient if the allegation is substantially proved (*b*). Thus, in the case of the King v. Lookup, on a prosecution for perjury, where the objection was, that the indictment stated a bill in Chancery to be directed to Robert Lord Henley, &c., and it appeared in evidence to have been directed to Sir Robert Henley, Knight, &c., the court overruled the objection, and held it to be sufficient, that the complainant had preferred a bill before the person who held the great seal, by whichever title he was styled (1). So, in the late case of Purcell v. Macnamara (2), in an action for a malicious prosecution, *where the allegation was, that the defendant pro- * 164

(1) R. v. Lookup, cit. 1 T. R. 240, 9 East 163. See also R. v. Payne, cit. 9 East 158.

(2) 9 East 157. See also Philips v. Bacon, 9 East 298.

standing that it is laid under a videlicet. It is by no means generally true that the omission of a videlicet will make it necessary to prove the particular sum or day, &c. strictly as laid. Some cases have been already mentioned, where a variance in the proof of such circumstances has been adjudged to be immaterial. (Vid. supra, p. 161.) It will be sufficient to add one other example. On an indictment for stealing goods in a dwelling-house, under the statute 12 Ann. St. 1. c. 7., it is not necessary to prove that the goods were of greater value than 40s., though that may be averred in the indictment without a videlicet. And see R. v. Burdett, 1 Ld. Raym. 149. R. v. Gillham, 6 T. R. 265. Gwinnet v. Philips, 3 T. R. 643. and 2 Campb. 231 (*a*).

(*a*) In an action on the case for causing the plaintiff's goods to be levied on after the return day, the day of the levy is material, and must be proved as laid in the declaration, although under a scilicet. *Vail* v. *Lewis and Livingston*, 4 *Johns. Rep.* 450. Vide 2 *Wms. Saund.* 291. *n.* *Myers* v. *Kent*, 2 *New Rep.* 463.

(*b*) Vide *Rodman and others* v. *Forman*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 26. *Page* v. *Woods*, 9 *Johns. Rep.* 82.

secuted an indictment against the plaintiff, until afterwards, sc. on a certain day named, the plaintiff was in due manner acquitted, &c.; and to prove this allegation the record of acquittal was produced, which showed that the acquittal was on another day, the court held that the variance was not material, and that the averment had been substantially proved. Here the day was not alleged as part of the description of the record; but the substance of the allegation was, that the plaintiff had been acquitted on the prosecution. And "it was no more necessary," said Mr. Justice Lawrence, "to prove the precise day of the acquittal as laid in the declaration, than it is, upon an indictment for murder, or in a declaration upon promises, to prove the precise day, as laid, of committing the murder or of making the promise." In this respect, it cannot be material, whether proof is by matter of record or by parol. If, indeed, the declaration had proceeded to state, that the acquittal was on a certain day, *as appears by the record*, that might have been considered as descriptive of the record, and then the variance would have been fatal (1) (*a*).

Variance in *time.*

It is a rule in pleading, that every material fact which is issuable and triable, must be averred to have happened at

(1) 9 East 161. And see Turner v. Eyles, 3 Bos. & Pul. 456. Wigley v. Jones, 5 East 440. Readshaw v. Wood, 4 Taunt. 13. Com. Dig. tit. Record, (C.)

(*a*) In an action against a sheriff for the escape of a prisoner in execution, the declaration stated a judgment for 5403 dollars and 77 cents, damages, and 37 dollars and 59 cents costs, and that a *ca. sa.* was issued thereon; and the *ca. sa.* produced in evidence was for 5441 dollars and 37 cents; it was held that the defendant in this collateral action could not take advantage of the variance. *Bissel* v. *Kip*, 5 *Johns. Rep.* 89. Where in a notice subjoined to a plea of the general issue, a record was stated to have been of June term, 1810, and the record produced in evidence was of June, 1809, the variance was held immaterial. *Brooks* v. *Bemiss*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 455.

a certain *time* (2). However, it will not generally be necessary to prove the time precisely as laid (*b*), unless that particular time is material. Thus in an action on a promissory note, where the declaration states that the defendant on such a day made, &c., proof that he made his promissory note on a different day would be sufficient. So, in an action for assault, battery, taking of goods, &c., where the defendant pleads the general issue, the plaintiff will not be confined to the day stated in the declaration, but may prove the assault, &c. on any other day before the commencement *of the action (1). If the defendant justifies by *son assault* on the same day, and the plaintiff traverses the cause of justification, and at the trial the defendant proves the trespass on the same day, there the plaintiff cannot give evidence of an assault on another day (2). And though the defendant should prove the assault of the plaintiff on another day, yet the plaintiff, after having made such a traverse, cannot prove another assault on a different day (3). *165

Variance in *place.*

With respect to variances in the *place* laid in the declaration (*a*): It has been held, in an action for non-residence,

(2) 5 T. R. 620.
(1) Co. Lit. 282. a. b. 2 Roll. Ab. 687. 689. tit. Verdict, (N.) Com. Dig. tit. Pleader, (S. 12.)
(2) Downes v. Skrymsher, Brownl. 233; 2 Roll. Ab. 687. l. 30, S. C.
(3) 2 Roll. Ab. 680. tit. Evidence, (C.) Art. 3. Thornton v. Lyster, Cro. Car. 514. *contra*, (Jones J. doubting), Roll. Ab. Ib. See 2 Saund. 5. note 3.

(*b*) Vide *The United States* v. *Vigol*, 2 *Dall.* 346.

(*a*) The place of transitory actions is not material, unless when made so by statute; therefore, in actions of assault, battery, taking of goods, &c. alleged to have been done in one county or town, if the plaintiff, on not guilty pleaded, prove the fact in some other county or town, he will be entitled to recover. But, in some cases the defendant may render the place material by pleading a justification which extends only to a certain place; as in trespass for a false imprisonment, if the defendant justifies as constable of D. in another county, and traverses every other place out of D. the plaintiff must prove an imprisonment out of D. So, in trespass for taking goods, the defendant may justify for damage fea-

where the parish was described as *St. Ethelburg*, and proved to be *St. Ethelburga*, that the variance was fatal (4): so, in an action of ejectment, where the premises were described as situate in the *united parishes of A. and B.*, but were proved to be in *the parish of A.*, and the two parishes were united only for the single purpose of maintaining the poor (5). But where the premises were described as lying in the *parish of A. and B.*, and it appeared in evidence that part lay in A. and part in B., but that there was no such parish as *the parish of A. and B.*, the court held that the word *parish* was mere surplusage, and that the plaintiff was entitled to recover the lands in B. as well as in A (6). So, where the premises were laid to be in the parish of *Farnham*, and were proved to be in the parish of *Farnham Royal*, but it did not appear that there were two *Farnhams*, the court held that the variance was immaterial (7); so also, in an action for use and occupation, where the premises were proved to lie in the parish
* 166 of *St. Mary Lambeth*, but *were described in the declaration as in the parish of *Lambeth*, which last was the name generally known (1). And this has overruled an older case (*a*), where a variance between the parish of *Chelsea* and the parish of *St. Luke's Chelsea* was held at nisi prius to be fatal (2). In an action for use and occupation, although it is not necessary to describe where the premises lie (3), yet if they are described in the declaration as situ-

(4) Wilson q. t. v. Gilbert, 2 Bos. & Pul. 281.

(5) Goodtitle dem. Pinsent v. Lammiman, 2 Campb. 274.

(6) Goodtitle dem. Bremridge v. Walter, 4 Taunt. 671. The case of Wilson v. Clark, therefore, (1 Esp. N. P. C. 273.), seems doubtful.

(7) Doe dem. Tollet v. Salter, 13 East 9.

(1) Kirtland v. Pounsett, 1 Taunt. 570.

(2) And see 3 Taunt. 140.

(3) King v. Fraser, 6 East 348.

---

sant in such a close or house, and traverse all other places. *Mostyn* v. *Fabrigas*, *Cowp.* 177. *Lit.* § 485. *Co. Lit.* 282. a. b. 2 *Wms. Saund.* 5. *b. Com. Dig. Action* (N. 12.) *Pleader* (G. 2.)

(*a*) Cited 13 *East's Rep.* 9. And see *Regina* v. *Inhabitants of Barking*, 2 *Salk.* 452. *Boddy* v. *Smith*, 1 *Str.* 595.

ate in a certain parish, and are proved to be in a different parish, the plaintiff cannot recover (4). Where the parish or place mentioned is mere matter of venue, and not of local description, (as, in an action for a nuisance defamatory to the plaintiff's character, where the declaration stated, that the defendant erected the nuisance complained of, in *the parish of A.*, in a street adjoining to the plaintiff's house, &c.,) the actual situation of the house is immaterial, and the plaintiff may recover, though it should be proved that there is no such parish (5).

The same rule which has been laid down with respect to civil actions, applies also to the case of an indictment; on the trial of which, it will be sufficient to show, that the offence was committed in some place within the county or other division; and it seems to be agreed, says Mr. Sergt. Hawkins (6), that *a mistake of the place* in which an offence is laid will not be material upon the evidence on "not guilty" pleaded, if the fact be proved at some other place in the same county. Where a felony is stated to have been committed at a certain place named in the indictment, and there is *no such place* in the county, the indictment is void (7) (*b*).

(4) Guest v. Caumont, 3 Campb. 235.

(5) Jefferies v. Duncombe, 11 East 226; 2 Campb. 3. S. C.

(6) B. 2. ch. 25. s. 84.

(7) St. 18 Hen. vi. c. 12. Hawk. Ib. See the case of Goodtitle dem. Bremridge v. Walter, *supra*, p. 165.

(*b*) Formerly the utmost nicety was required in setting forth a writing, and a mistake in a single letter was sufficient to defeat an action; thus in an information for a libel, where the word *nor* was written for *not*, although the sense was not altered thereby, it was held a fatal variance. *Regina* v. *Drake*, 2 *Salk.* 660. So, *indicari* for *indictari*, *Parker's case*, *Hutt.* 56. So, in stating the name of a corporation, the variance of a letter was held fatal; as when the South Sea Company was named, the company trading "ad maria *Austrialia*," instead of *Australia*. *Turvil* v. *Aynsworth*, 2 *Str.* 787. S. C. 2 *Ld. Raym.* 1515. But the rule now established appears to be, that where the meaning is obvious, a mistake in, or even the omission of a word, will not vitiate. So, on the issue

*Sect. VI.

That the best Evidence is to be produced, which the Nature of the Case admits.

The next general rule is, that the best evidence must be given (*a*) of which the nature of the thing is capable (1).

(1) Gilb. Ev. 13. Bull. N.P. 293.

---

of *nul tiel record*, where one was *Segrave* and the other *Seagrave*, the court held it no variance, quia idem sonans. *Williams* v. *Ogle*, 2 *Str.* 889. So, in an indictment for perjury in an affidavit, the word *understood*, in setting out the affidavit, was written *undertood*, and it was held immaterial. *Rex* v. *Beach*, *Cowp.* 229. So, in an indictment for forging a bill of exchange, which was set forth in the indictment secundum tenorem, and in the bill produced in evidence, the word *received* was written *recievd*, the variance was held not to be fatal. *Rex* v. *Hart*, 1 *Leach* 172. In an indictment for perjury in reciting that part of an indictment for assault and battery, where it was alleged that his life was greatly despaired of, the word *despaired* was entirely omitted; and Buller, J. overruled the objection of a variance. *Rex* v. *May*, 1 *Leach* 227. In an action for a libel, the libellous matter set forth in the declaration, contained the words *U. States*, and in the paper produced in evidence it was written *United States*, the variance was held immaterial, this being a common and well understood abbreviation; or, if the *U.* might be rejected, still the sense and meaning of the libel would be the same; and the court may look at the context in order to judge of the materiality of the variance. *Lewis* v. *Few*, 5 *Johns. Rep.* 1. Where the declaration stated a libel to have been published in a newspaper called *The Ontario Messenger*, and the paper produced was headed *Ontario Messenger*, it was held that this was not a variance. *Southwick* v. *Stevens*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 443. An insensible or nonsensical word inserted in the declaration, setting out a writing, may be rejected as surplusage. *King* v. *Pippet*, 1 *Term. Rep.* 235.

(*a*) Vide *Smith and others* v. *Carrington and others*, 4 *Cranch* 62. *Wood* v. *Roach*, 2 *Dall.* 180. *Thompson* v. *Bullock*, 1 *Bay* 364. *Torrey* v. *Fuller*, 1 *Mass. Rep.* 524.

The true meaning of this rule is, not that courts of law require the strongest possible assurance of the matter in question, but that no evidence shall be given, which, from the nature of the thing, supposes still greater evidence behind in the party's possession or power; for, such evidence is altogether insufficient, and proves nothing, but carries with it a presumption contrary to the intention for which it is produced. Thus, if a party offer a copy of a deed or will, where he is able to produce the original, this raises a presumption, that there is something in the deed or will, which, if produced, would make against the party; and, therefore, the copy in such a case is not evidence. But, if he prove the original deed or will to be in the hands of the adverse party, to whom he has given notice to produce it, or that the original has been destroyed without his default, no such presumption can reasonably be made, and a copy will be admitted, because then such copy is the best evidence that can be produced (2). For the same reason parol evidence is not admissible to prove the contents of a license from the crown, though the license is lost, because there must be some register of it at the secretary of state's office, and that register would be better than parol evidence (3) (*b*).

(2) Gilb. Ev. 13. Bull. 293. Garnons v. Swift, 1 Taunt. 507.

(3) Rhind v. Wilkinson, 2 Taunt. 237.

(*b*) So, the declarations of a person who might have been produced as a witness are inadmissible. 2 *Day* 126. *Alexander* v. *Mahon*, 11 *Johns. Rep.* 185. A witness cannot testify as to the contents of a paper in his possession; it should be produced. *Richards* v. *Stewart*, 2 *Day* 328. Where on an indictment for forgery of a bank note, a witness was produced to prove the identity of the bill, on which he had not made any private artificial mark, although there were accidental marks on it, and which, after he had received it, had been out of his possession; it was held, that if he had made any private artificial mark to which he could positively swear, his testimony would be admissible, but not having done so, the person in whose possession the note had been ought to have been produced, as the highest evidence. *Commonwealth* v. *Kinson*, 4 *Mass. Rep.* 646.

This principle is strongly illustrated by a late case (4), where the question was, whether the defendants had put on board the plaintiff's ship some articles of a combustible
* 168 *and dangerous kind, without giving due notice of their nature. It appeared in evidence at the trial, that the goods were delivered by the officer of the defendants, with a written order to the plaintiff to receive them, in which order nothing was said as to their nature, that they were received by the chief mate of the plaintiff's ship, who had since died, and that no other person was present at the time of the delivery. It was further proved, by the captain of the ship and the second mate, that no communication had been made to either of them, nor, as far as they knew, to any other person on board. Upon this evidence the plaintiff, who had to prove the negative, was nonsuited, on the ground that he had not given the best evidence of the want of notice, which it was in his power to produce, by calling the company's officer, who delivered the articles on board. And the nonsuit was afterwards affirmed by the Court of King's bench. "The best evidence, (said Lord Ellenborough in delivering the opinion of the court,) should have been given, of which the nature of the case was capable. The best evidence was to have been had, by calling, in the first instance, upon the persons immediately and officially employed in the delivering and in the receiving of the goods on board, who appear in this case to have been the first mate, on the one side, and the military conductor, the defendant's officer, on the other; and though the one of these persons, the mate, was dead, that did not warrant the plaintiff in resorting to an inferior and secondary species of testimony, (namely, the presumption and inference arising from a non-communication to the other persons on board), as long as the military conductor, the other living witness, immediately and primarily concerned in the transaction of shipping the goods on board, could be resorted to; and no impossibi-

(4) Williams v. East India Company, 3 East 193. 201.

lity of resorting to this evidence, the proper and primary evidence on the subject, is suggested to exist in this case.

It has been already observed, that although the best evidence is to be given which the nature of the case admits, *yet the strongest possible assurance of a fact is not required. If a deed, for example, is attested by several subscribing witnesses, the execution may be proved by one of them; or, if none of those witnesses can be produced, proof of the signature of one witness will be sufficient; for the proof is, as far as it goes, complete, and not inferior, in its kind, to any that can be produced; nor, can it be inferred, merely from the absence of further proof of the same kind, that such additional proof would be inconsistent with that already produced. So, to prove the plaintiff's demand satisfied, the defendant may give evidence of an admission by the plaintiff to that effect, though it should appear that the plaintiff also signed a receipt, and it may be said the receipt would be more satisfactory proof(1). And where an agent for the plaintiff made a verbal agreement with the defendant, and afterwards put it down in writing, which was not signed by the parties, as a memorandum to assist his recollection, such writing is not the best evidence, nor indeed any evidence of the agreement, though it may be used by the agent for the purpose of refreshing his memory (2) (*a*). So, if parol evidence should be offered to prove a tenancy, it is no objection that there is some written agreement relative to the holding, unless it should appear that the agreement was between the landlord and tenant, and that it continued in force to the very time, to which the parol evidence applies (3). And in a great variety of cases, which have been before mentioned, *prima facie* or presumptive proof is admissible, although perhaps stronger evidence might have been produced. * 169

(1) Jacob v. Lindsay, 1 East 460. Smith v. Young, 1 Campb. 439.

(2) Dalison v. Stark, 4 Esp. N. P. C. 163. 1 East 460.

(3) Doe d. Wood v. Morris, 12 East 237. Doe v. Pearson, 12 East 239. n.

(*a*) Vide *Waring* v. *Warren*, 1 *Johns. Rep.* 340.

Upon the same principle, it will not be necessary to call the supposed writer of an instrument, for the purpose of proving or disproving his hand-writing; but the evidence of persons well acquainted with the character of his writ-
* 170 ing *will be sufficient. Such evidence is not, in its nature, inferior or secondary; and though it may generally be true, that a writer is best acquainted with his own hand-writing, yet his knowledge is acquired precisely by the same means as the knowledge of other persons, who have been in the habit of seeing him write, and differs not so much in kind as in degree. The testimony of such persons, therefore, is not of an inferior or secondary species; nor does it give any reason to suspect, as in the case where primary evidence is withheld, that the fact to which they speak is not true. It is the common practice to receive such testimony in ordinary cases; and, in prosecutions for capital offences, it must be equally admissible. On a prosecution for the forgery of a bank note (1), therefore, Mr. Justice Le Blanc held, that the signature in the name of the cashier of the bank might be disproved by any other person, who was acquainted with his hand-writing, though the cashier himself was not an incompetent witness (2).

The rule which requires the best evidence to be produced, is dispensed with in some particular cases.

First, where it is necessary to prove an entry in a public book, the original need not be shown; but, for the convenience of the public, a sworn copy will be admitted (3).

Secondly, in the case of all peace-officers, justices of the peace, constables, &c. (*a*), it is sufficient to prove that they acted in these characters, without producing their

(1) Hughes's case, 1802, 2 East P. C. 1002; M'Guire's case, 1801, S. P. ib. Contra, Smith's case, 1768, 2 East P. C. 1000. See *post.* as to proof of hand-writing.

(2) Newland's case, 2 East P. C. 1001.

(3) See part 2. ch. 6. *ad finem.*

(*a*) S. P. *Potter* v. *Luther*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 431. *Young and others* v. *The Commonwealth*, 6 *Binney* 88. *Fowler* v. *Bebee and another*, 9 *Mass. Rep.* 231.

appointments (4). And in the case of officers of any branch of the revenue, where the question is whether they are such, proof of being reputed to be so, or of having exercised the office, *is good evidence of the fact (*a*), on any indictment, information, action, or prosecution whatsoever (1). So, on an indictment for perjury committed by the defendant before a surrogate in an ecclesiastical court, proof that the person who administered the oath, acted as surrogate, has been held to be sufficient *prima facie* evidence of his appointment and authority (2). * 171

Thirdly, there are other instances in which strict proof is made unnecessary, because the party, against whom it would otherwise be requisite to produce proof of the particular fact, has by his conduct precluded himself from disputing the fact (3). Such is the rule in an action against clergymen for non-residence, in which it is reasonable, that the acts of the defendant as parson, and his receipt of the emoluments of the church, should be evidence against him of his being parson, without formal proof of the defendant's title (4). So, in an action by a person, as farmer and renter of tolls, appointed under an act of parliament, for tolls due at a turnpike-gate, although the plaintiff will not be entitled to recover on the special count, unless he has been legally appointed collector of the tolls, yet, if the defendant has accounted with him in that character, the want of a formal appointment will not preclude him from recovering on an account stated (5). So, a tenant is con-

(4) By Buller, J. in Berryman v. Wise, 4 T. R. 366. By the opinion of all the judges in the case of the Gordons tried for murder in 1789, Leach Cr. C. 585.

(1) St. 26 G. 3. c. 77. s. 13., and see St. 11 G. 1. c. 30. s. 32.

(2) R. v. Verelst, 3 Campb. 432.

(3) By Chambre, J., Smith v. Taylor, 1 Bos. & Pul. N. R. 210.

(4) By Chambre, J., ib. Bevan q. t. v. Williams, n. (a). 3 T. R. 635.

(5) Peacock v. Harris, 10 East 104.

(*a*) So, on the trial of an indictment for obstructing an inspector of the customs, it is not necessary to produce the commission of the collector who appoints him; but proof that the collector acts in such office, de facto, is sufficient. *United States* v. *Sears et al. Rep. C. C. U. S. first circuit*, 215.

sidered as admitting the title of the landlord, under whom he holds, and will not be permitted afterwards to dispute it (*b*).

This principle was carried farther in the case of Radford q. t. v. M'Intosh; too far indeed, in the opinion of one learned Judge (6). That was an action for penalties under the post-horse act, brought by the plaintiff as farmer-general, and proof of his appointment was dispensed with, be-
* 172 *cause the defendant had previously accounted with him as farmer-general (1). So, in an action for subtraction of tithes, proof of the defendant's former acknowledgment of the plaintiff's title to the tithes is sufficient evidence, as against the defendant a wrong-doer (2). So, in an action against the defendant for slander, in charging the plaintiff with being a swindler, and threatening that he would have him struck off the roll of attorneys, the Court was of opinion, that the defendant's threat amounted to a distinct acknow-

(6) Chambre, J. 1 Bos. & Pul. N. R. 211.

(1) 3 T. R. 632. And see Cross v. Kaye, 6 T. R. 663., and 1 New Rep. 211.

(2) 1 Bos. & Pul. N. R. 210. 3 T. R. 635. 4 T. R. 366. 4 Gwill. 1483.

(*b*) Vide *Jackson d. Low & others* v. *Reynolds*, 1 *Caines' Rep.* 444. *Jackson d. Bleecker* v. *Whitford*, 2 *Caines' Rep.* 215. *Jackson d. Van Alen* v. *Vosburgh*, 7 *Johns. Rep.* 186. *Brant d. Cuyler & others* v. *Livermore*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 358. *Jackson d. Anderson & another* v. *M'Leod*, 12 *Johns. Rep.* 182. And a person, who has purchased the interest of the tenant at a sale under an execution, is equally precluded from contesting the landlord's title. *Jackson d. Klein* v. *Graham*, 3 *Caines' Rep.* 188. A tenant however may show that the lessor's title had expired. *England d. Syburn* v. *Slade*, 4 *Term Rep.* 682. But in an action for use and occupation it was held that the tenant of a copyhold tenement could not show that it had been seized as forfeited by the lord of the manor, unless he had disclaimed holding of the plaintiff, and entered afresh under the new landlord. *Ball* v. *Westwood*, 2 *Campb.* 11.

In an action against several defendants as partners, their acts and declarations are evidence of the existence of the partnership without producing the written agreement of partnership. *Widdifield* v. *Widdifield*, 2 *Binney* 245.

ledgment that the plaintiff was an attorney, and dispensed with further proof (3). The principle to be extracted from these cases seems to be, that where a defendant, in the course of the transaction, on which the action is founded, has admitted the title, by virtue of which the plaintiff sues, it amounts to *prima facie* evidence, that the plaintiff is entitled to sue (4). And upon this principle two of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas were of opinion that the plaintiff was entitled to recover in the case of Smith v. Taylor (5). That was an action for defamation, in which the plaintiff averred, that he was a physician and exercised the profession, and that the words were spoken concerning him as a physician. The material facts of the case were shortly these; the plaintiff, having practised the profession of a physician, was called upon to attend a sick person, for whom he prescribed; the defendant was employed as apothecary, and made up the prescription; in this situation of things, the defendant spoke the words charged in the declaration, which did not impute to the plaintiff any want of qualification by degree, but called him by his professional title of doctor, and ascribed to him mal-practice in his treatment of the patient. "The question," said the Chief Justice, "is, whether, in this particular action upon these particular words, the evidence offered was not sufficient **prima facie* evidence that the plaintiff had lawfully practised as a qualified authorized doctor of physic? And considering the nature of the words and the situation of the defendant, that the charge had no relation to the want of qualification but merely to the practice, and that it was accompanied by the expression 'Dr. S.,' I think that these circumstances afforded sufficient *prima facie* evidence that the plaintiff was doctor." If, indeed, the words imply a charge that the plaintiff was not *qualified* to act in the particular character which he assumed, he ought to prove his qualification, and it will not be sufficient to show that

* 173

(3) Berryman v. Wise, 4 T. R. 366.

(4) By Heath, J. 1 New Rep. 208.

(5) 1 New Rep. 196. Mansfield, C. J. and Heath, J.; Rooke, J., and Chambre, J., *contra*.

he acted in that capacity (1). And where the words imply merely ignorance or negligence, without admitting the plaintiff to be qualified, and the plaintiff avers that he is qualified, he will be bound to prove his qualification (2).

Sect. VII.

That Hearsay is not Evidence.

It is a general principle in the law of evidence, that, if any fact is to be substantiated against a person, it ought to be proved in his presence by the testimony of a witness sworn to speak the truth; and the reason of the rule is, because evidence ought to be given under the sanction of an oath, and that the person, who is to be affected by the evidence, may have an opportunity of interrogating the witness as to his means of knowledge and concerning all the particulars of the fact.

Hearsay evidence of a fact, therefore, is not admissible (*a*). And the same principle is applicable to statements in writing, no less than to words spoken: whether spoken or written, they are equally inadmissible in evi-
*174 dence. The *only difference between them in this respect is, that there is a greater facility of proof in the one case than in the other; a written account is proved to be genuine, by proof of the hand-writing; but the genuineness of mere oral declarations must depend upon the memory and accuracy of the witness, who professess to repeat them.

(1) Pickford v. Gutch, 8 T. R. 305., n. (a).; Moises v. Thornton, 8 T. R. 303. In this last case, there was also an averment, that the plaintiff (*had taken the degree of doctor of physic*) was duly qualified.

(2) See 1 New Rep. 204. 210.

(*a*) Vide *Overseers of Germantown* v. *Overseers of Livingston*, 2 *Caines' Rep.* 107. *Jackson d. Watson* v. *Cris*, 11 *Johns. Rep.* 437. *Claiborne* v. *Parrish*, 2 *Wash.* 146. *Gray* v. *Goodrich*, 7 *Johns. Rep.* 95.

To this general rule there are some exceptions, which will be separately considered. Exceptions.

First, with regard to hearsay on questions of pedigree. "On inquiring into the truth of facts, which happened a long time ago, the courts have varied from the strict rules of evidence applicable to modern facts of the same description, on account of the great difficulty of proving those remote facts in the ordinary manner, by living witnesses. On this principle, hearsay and reputation (which latter is the hearsay of those who may be supposed to have known the fact, handed down from one to another,) have been admitted as evidence in cases of pedigree (1) (*a*)." Thus, declarations of deceased members of the family are admissible evidence to prove relationship, as, who was a person's grandfather, or whom he married, or how many children he had, or as to the time of marriage or of the birth of a child, and the like, "of which it cannot be reasonably presumed, that better evidence is to be procured." In ancient times, while the feudal system prevailed, great facilities of establishing descents were afforded by means of inquisitions post mortem. The heads of families, upon these occasions, made solemn declarations, which were preserved as matter of record (2). But, these having now grown into disuse, it is often extremely difficult to prove a pedigree; and recourse must be had, from necessity, to the best evidence that the nature of the subject will admit. *In a late case, proof by one of the family, that a particular person had many years before gone abroad, and was supposed to have died there, and that the witness had not heard in the family of his having married, was considered by the Court of King's Bench, good prima facie evidence of the person's death without lawful issue (1). In case of *pedigree*, &c. * 175

(1) Per Le Blanc, J. in Higham v. Ridgway, 10 East 120. And see the Chancellor's judgment in the case of Vowles v. Young, 13 Ves. jun. 143.

(2) 13 Ves. jun. 143.

(1) Doe dem. Banning v. Griffin, 15 East 293.

(*a*) Vide *Strickland's Lessee* v. *Pool*, 1 *Dall.* 14.

It is not, however, every statement or tradition in the family, that can be admitted in evidence. "The tradition," said Lord Eldon in the case of Whitlocke v. Baker (2), "must be from persons having such a connexion with the party to whom it relates, that it is natural and likely, from their domestic habits and connexions, that they are speaking the truth, and that they could not be mistaken. Declarations in the family, descriptions in wills, descriptions upon monuments, in bibles (*a*) and registry books (*b*), are all admitted upon the principle, that they are the natural effusions of a party, who must know the truth, and who speaks upon an occasion, when his mind stands in an even position, without any temptation to exceed or fall short of the truth." Lord Thurlow appears to have adopted the rule with the same limitations. It was his opinion, (as the Chancellor stated in the late case of the Berkeley peerage, where this subject was much discussed,) that declarations made for the express purpose of being given in evidence, on a question of pedigree, could not be received. If, for example, he said, a person were to take up his family bible, and, conceiving the idea of its being afterwards produced in evidence, were to write down *uno flatu* the births and deaths of his children, such an entry would not be admissible (*c*).

(2) 13 Ves. 514.

(*a*) Vide *Douglas's Lessee* v. *Sanderson*, 2 *Dall.* 116.

(*b*) So, the original registry kept by a religious society of the births and deaths among its members is evidence. *Stoever* v. *Whitman's Lessee*, 6 *Binney* 416.

(*c*) In an action of ejectment for land in the state of New-York, the lessors of the plaintiff resided in England, and claimed to be heirs of the person who died seised of the premises: a witness deposed at the trial, that he knew the ancestor, and had charge of the land as his agent, and corresponded with him, and after his death with the lessor, who sent him a power to act for him as heir and devisee, and that his information was also derived from persons acquainted with the family of the lessors; it was held that

Descriptions in family bibles have been mentioned only by way of example. The admissibility of such entries, it is scarcely necessary to observe, can in no degree depend *upon the circumstance of their being inserted in the family bible, though on that account the statement may be entitled to greater consideration. A memorandum inserted in any other book, by one of the family, may be given in evidence. So, a will by an ancestor is evidence on a question of pedigree, (though it be found cancelled, and not known to have been proved or acted upon,) if it appears to be treated as a paper relating to the family (1). And recitals in family deeds, monumental inscriptions, engravings on rings, old pedigrees hung up in a family mansion, and the like, (in which it is improbable that a description would be suffered to continue, if erroneous,) are all of them admissible upon the same principle (2). * 176

Declarations made by a deceased husband, as to the legitimacy of his wife, are evidence, though he was not related to her by blood; for the husband must be supposed to have more intimate knowledge on that subject, than a distant relation (3). But the opinion of deceased neighbours, or of acquaintances of the family, are not evidence on a question of pedigree (4); nor is the hearsay of a relative to be admitted, when the relative himself can be produced (5).

(1) Doe d. Johnson v. Lord Pembroke, 11 East 505.

(2) 13 Ves. jun. 144. Bull. N. P. 233. Cowp. 594. 10 East 120.

(3) Vowles v. Young, 13 Ves. jun. 148.

(4) 13 Ves. jun. 147. 514. 3 T. R. 723. See Bull. N. P. 295. 1 Maul. & Sel. 689. 14 East 330.

(5) Pendrel v. Pendrel, 2 Str. 924. Bull. N. P. 113. Harrison v. Blades, 3 Campb. 457.

---

the knowledge thus derived by the witness of the death of the ancestor and heirship of the lessor, was evidence of pedigree sufficient to go to the jury. Thompson, J. in delivering the opinion of the court observes, that the books furnish us with no definite or precise rule on the subject: almost any circumstances which are calculated to show a general reputation and afford reasonable grounds of belief, are received as evidence of pedigree. *Jackson d. Ross & others* v. *Cooley*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 128.

The declarations of a deceased member of the family are not to be admitted, unless, as was before mentioned, they have been made under circumstances, when the relation may be supposed without an interest and without a bias. If they were made on a subject in dispute, after the commencement of a suit, or after a controversy preparatory to one, they ought not to be received in evidence, on account of the probability, that they were partially drawn from the deceased, or perhaps intended by him, to serve one of the
* 177 *contending parties. There has been some difference of opinion on this subject. In a case, reported in Viner's Abridgement (1), Ch. B. Reynolds refused to admit declarations, which had been made at a time when the point had become the subject of controversy. On the other hand such evidence was received by Lord Camden (2); and Lord Mansfield in the case of Goodright on the demise of Stevens v. Moss (3) was of opinion, that an answer* by a deceased mother to a bill filed against her, stating the time of a child's birth, might be admitted as evidence on the footing of a declaration. On the trial of the cause, Mr. Baron Eyre rejected this answer, together with the general declarations of the father and mother; in consequence of

(1) Dev. Sp. Ass. 1731. Vin. Ab. Ev. [T. b. 91.]

(2) Hayward v. Firmion, cor. Lord Camden, Sitt. after Tr. term 1766, cited by Lawrence, J. in the Berkeley peerage case; and see Nichols v. Parker, Exr. Sp. Ass. 1805, 14 East 331. *n.*

(3) Cowp. 594.

* The answer is described by the reporter of this case as an answer in Chancery. It appears from an inquiry, which was made in the case of the Berkeley peerage, that proceedings had been instituted in the Court of Chancery, and that afterwards a bill was filed in the Exchequer, by the youngest son, claiming as a legitimate child, against the mother who was administratrix of her deceased husband. The mother in her answer averred, that the complainant was born before marriage and illegitimate. Now as she was entitled as administratrix to a distributive share of the husband's effects, and was therefore interested to defeat the right of any other persons, who might claim a part under the distribution, her answer most clearly ought not to have been admitted. This objection however was not adverted to; nor does it seem to have occurred, that the statement in the answer was inadmissible, as having been made after the commencement of a suit.

which, an application was made to the Court of King's Bench for a new trial. Lord Mansfield, on that occasion, considered the rejection either of the general declarations or of the answer to be a sufficient ground for a new trial; but he adverted more particularly to the former; and it does not appear from the report, that he laid any great stress on the rejection of the answer. Mr. Justice Aston concurred with Lord Mansfield in opinion, that the general declarations ought to have been admitted, but delivered *no opinion on the other point. Thus, the authorities on this subject appear to have been, at one time, nearly evenly balanced. * 178

Great light has been thrown upon this subject by the opinions of many of the Judges in the late case of the Berkeley peerage (1). A question was on that occasion proposed to the Judges (2), in the following terms: "Upon the trial of an ejectment respecting Black Acre between A and B, (in which it was necessary for A to prove that he was the legitimate son of J S,) A, after proving by other evidence that J S was his reputed father, offered to give in evidence a deposition made by J S in a cause in Chancery instituted by A against C D in order to perpetuate testimony to the alleged fact, (disputed by C D,) that he was the legitimate son of J S, in which character he claimed an estate in remainder in White Acre, which was also claimed in remainder by C D. B, the defendant in the ejectment, did not claim Black Acre under either A or C D, the plaintiff and defendant in the Chancery suit. According to law, could the deposition of J S be received in evidence upon the trial of such ejectment against B, as evidence of declarations of J S, the alleged father, in matters of pedigree?" The Judges present afterwards stated their opinions at length, and, with only one dissentient voice, agreed in considering the deposition of J S to be inadmissible. "The ground," said Mr. Justice Lawrence in de-

(1) May 13, 1811. MS. See also the case of the Banbury peerage claim, 1809, 2 Sel. N. P. 684.

(2) May 2, 1811 MS.

livering his opinion, "upon which the declarations of deceased members of the family are admitted in evidence in matters of pedigree, is the necessity of the case. But as the first object is to administer justice with as much certainty as possible, it is reasonable that only such declarations should be received, as have in their favour a presumption of being consistent with the truth. This presumption must depend upon circumstances; and if the relator has no *interest to serve, nor any object to answer, as may be the case where declarations are made subsequent to the commencement of a suit, and if there is no ground for supposing that the relator's mind has any bias, it is not unreasonable to conclude, that he has neither exceeded nor stopped short of the limits of truth. In such a case, therefore, the admission of these declarations, though without the sanction of an oath and without any opportunity of cross-examination, may be attended with less inconvenience than would follow from the total rejection of the evidence. But mischievous indeed would be the admission of such evidence, even with the usual sanction of an oath, if the declarations were made under that bias or feeling of interest, which may be expected to arise in the course of a controversy." For these reasons the deposition was not admissible as a declaration. Nor could it be admitted, as the answer of a witness in a judicial proceeding. "For a deposition," continued Mr. Justice Lawrence, "is the answer of a witness to such interrogations, as a litigating party suggests for the purpose of establishing certain facts, and is considered to be a partial representation, as against all persons who have no opportunity of drawing out the whole truth by cross-examination; on this account, it ought not to be received as evidence against a stranger."

*179

So, where the question was, whether the occupier of a particular farm was liable to the repair of a public road, and, to prove the affirmative, an award was produced, (which had been made some years before, when the same question was the subject of dispute between a former oc-

cupier and the township, where the lands were situated,) this evidence was rejected as inadmissible; on the ground, that the account, which deceased witnesses might have given to the arbitrator on that occasion, could not have been received, as the declarations were made *post litem motam*, and that the opinion of the arbitrator, formed upon such testimony, could not be entitled to more credit (1). And upon the *same principle, it should seem, depositions on a question of custom would not now be admitted in evidence against a person not claiming under any of the parties to the suit, in which the depositions were taken. * 180

Hearsay as to *time of birth.*

On a question, whether a testator at the time of making his will was of full age, a written memorandum by his deceased father, stating the time of his birth, has been admitted to be good evidence (1). Here the controversy was not, as in a question of pedigree, from what parents he derived his birth, but at what precise time an undisputed birth had happened. Still however the observation, before made, applies to this sort of evidence, namely, that the father had peculiar means of knowing the fact in dispute without any interest to misrepresent it, and the fact itself was not a matter of notoriety, but necessarily lying within the knowledge of a few individuals of the family. So, on a question of legitimacy, the declarations of deceased persons, supposed to have been married, (who might themselves be examined if alive,) are admissible to disprove the fact of marriage (2).

As to *place of birth*, &c.

The declarations of a deceased parent, though they are evidence of the *time* of a child's birth, will not be admitted as evidence of the *place* of the birth (3). "The point in dispute (said Lord Ellenborough, in a case where the admissibility of such evidence was discussed,) turns on a single fact, involving only a question of locality, and there-

(1) R. v. Cotton, 3 Campb. 444. cor. Dampier, J.

(1) Herbert v. Tuckal, Tr. at bar, Sir T. Raym. 84. cited in Brune v. Rawlins, 7 East 290; and see 10 East 120.

(2) R. v. Bramley, 6 T. R. 330. May v. May, 1762, Tr. at bar, Bull. N. P. 112.

(3) R. v. Erith, 8 East 542.

fore not falling within the principle of the rules applicable to cases of pedigree." Nor can the declarations of a father or mother be received after their deaths to prove the want of access, so as to bastardize a child born during the marriage; for they could not be examined to that fact, if alive (4) (*a*); *and, even if that objection were removed, still, the case would not come within the principle on which such hearsay evidence can be made an exception to the general rule; as want of access (1), implying the continued separation of the parties, must be notorious to the whole neighbourhood, where they have resided, and is therefore capable of a more satisfactory proof. For the same reason, the declaration of a deceased person, as to having been relieved by a parish (2), or as to being hired for a year (3), are not evidence of those facts, on an appeal against an order of removal.

* 181

The case, where the declaration of a parent was received as evidence of the time of a child's birth, has been before mentioned. From analogy to this, the declaration or written memorandum of a deceased surgeon, respecting the time of a birth at which he attended, appears to be evidence, as it was made on a matter peculiarly within his knowledge (4). And, for the same reason, the account, which a deceased person has given respecting his own bodily state during illness, or immediately after an injury, is admissible (5). In the case of Aveson v. Lord Kinnaird (6), which was an action upon a life-insurance of the plaintiff's wife, and where the question was, whether her life was in an insurable state, the account which she gave

(4) R. v. Reading, Rep. temp. Hard. 79; Bull. N. P. 113. S. C. Stevens v. Moss, Cowp. 592. R. v. Luffe, 8 East 203. R. v. Kea, 11 East 133.

(1) Bull. N. P. 113.

(2) R. v. Chadderton, 2 East 29.

(3) R. v. Nuneham Courtney, 1 East 373. R. v. Ferry Fristone, 2 East 55. R. v. Abergwilly, 2 East 63.

(4) See 10 East 120. and Vin. Ab. Ev. T. b. 91.

(5) Aveson v. Lord Kinnaird, 6 East 193. 198. Thompson and Wife v. Trevannion, Skin. 402.

(6) 6 East 188.

(*a*) Vide *Bowles* v. *Bingham*, 2 *Mun.* 442.

of herself, explaining her appearance, in answer to inquiries a few days after the certificate of her health had been obtained, and her account also of the state, in which she had previously been at the time of obtaining the certificate, were received at the trial, and afterwards adjudged by the Court of King's Bench to be admissible evidence, for the purpose of showing that the wife was not in the *state of health described in the certificate. The substance of the conversation was, that she had continued ill from the time of obtaining the certificate down to the time when the conversation took place; and the declarations were held to be admissible, in the first place, as showing the opinion, which the deceased had of her own state of health, when the certificate was made out; and secondly, they were properly received, as evidence to contradict a surgeon, who had been called on the part of the plaintiff. So, to prove seisin in a devisor, the declarations of a deceased occupier of the land in question, that he held as his tenant, were received as evidence of that fact (1). Without such evidence it might have been impossible to prove an occupation by the deceased tenant under a particular person, though the simple fact of his occupation must have been capable of other proof; and, in addition to the circumstance of his having a peculiar knowledge of the fact, it may be observed, that the declaration was in some degree against his interest, since, in case of an action by his landlord, it might have been produced as evidence against him, or against any claiming under him (2). For the same reason, where the point was, whether certain lands were parcel of A's or B's estate, the declarations of a deceased occupier, who held under both A and B, have been admitted in evidence (3) (*a*).

* 182

(1) Holloway v. Rakes, cited by Buller, J. in Davies v. Pierce, 2 T. R. 55. Uncle v. Watson, 4 Taunt. 16.

(2) Uncle v. Watson, 4 Taunt. 16.

(3) Roll v. Fellow, cor. Lord Hardwicke, C. J. Exr. Sp. Ass. 1735, Vin. Ab. Ev. [A. b. 38.] pl. 10. Sir J. Bridgman v. Jennings, 1 Ld. Raym. 734. Davies v. Pierce, 2 T. R. 53.

(*a*) So, where a party claimed common pur cause de vicinage as appurtenant to a messuage, the declaration of a former tenant of

As to *custom*, &c.

In questions upon a boundary between parishes (*b*) or manors (4) (*c*), or on a customary right (5), or on parochial or manorial customs (5), declarations as to the common opinion of the place, made by deceased persons, who from
* 183 *their situation had the means of knowledge and no interest to misrepresent, have been generally considered admissi-

(4) Nichols v. Parker, 14 East 331. n.

(5) Denn v. Spray, 1 T. R. 466. Beebee v. Parker, 5 T. R. 26. 31. Chapman v. Smith, 3 Gwill. 854. 2 Ves. 512. S. C. Doe d. Allason v. Sisson, 12 East 62. Morewood v. Wood, 14 East 327. n. Nichols v. Parker, ib. 331. n. And see Weeks v. Sparke, 1 Maul. & Sel. 679. 684. 636; Harwood v. Sims, 1 Wightw. 112.

---

the same messuage as to such right, was held admissible, although the tenant was living. *Walker* v. *Broadstock*, 1 *Esp. Rep.* 458. In an action of ejectment to recover premises demised by a lease containing a clause of re-entry in case the lessee underlet, it was held that the declarations of a person in possession, under the lessee, were prima facie evidence of the fact of underletting. *Doe d. Hindly* v. *Rickarby*, 5 *Esp. Rep.* 4. Vide *Andrew's Lessee* v. *Fleming*, 2 *Dall.* 93. Declarations by the tenants or occupants of land are admissible no further than as they relate to the tenancy or possession: they are not evidence in respect of the title, except as the declarations of a person claiming land or through whom land is claimed, *against his interest*, may be evidence on the same principle as admissions and confessions in other cases. *Jackson d. Youngs* v. *Vredenburgh*, 1 *Johns. Rep.* 159. *Waring* v. *Warren*, *Id.* 340. *Jackson d. Griswold* v. *Bard*, 4 *Johns. Rep.* 230. *Jackson d. Burr & O'Reilly* v. *Shearman*, 6 *Johns. Rep.* 19. *Bartlet* v. *Delprat & others*, 4 *Mass. Rep.* 702. *Jackson d. M'Donald* v. *M'Call*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 377. *Nichols* v. *Hotchkiss*, 2 *Day* 127.

(*b*) Vide *Rex* v. *Hammersmith*, *Peake's Ev. App.* 69.

(*c*) So, the declarations of a person deceased, who surveyed the land in question, as to the boundaries are admissible. *Caufman* v. *Presbyterian Congregation of Cedar Spring*, 6 *Binney* 59. But the declarations of a deceased surveyor that he had been authorized by the proprietaries of the state to survey land for A. B. under whom the plaintiff's lessee claimed, are inadmissible to establish the plaintiff's title, although the surveyor's official papers had been accidentally destroyed. *Bonnet's Lessee* v. *Devebaugh & Smith*, 3 *Binney* 175.

ble evidence. So, perambulations are evidence of the extent of a particular parish or manor; since it may be inferred, that those who perambulated, believed the line of their perambulation to be the boundary of the district, and such acts are in some measure an exercise of the right (1). Such evidence has been admitted from analogy to cases of *public rights*, in which it is clearly established that reputation is admissible. A right of common by custom is, strictly speaking, a private right; but it is a *general* right, and, therefore, (so far as it regards the admissibility of this species of evidence), has been considered as *public*, because it affects a large number of occupiers within a district. But it is to be observed, the evidence is to be confined to what such old persons have said, as were in a situation to know what the rights were; and before a customary right can be proved by such evidence, a foundation ought to be laid by showing an exercise of the right, or acts of enjoyment within the period of living memory; it is the exercise of the right, that lets in the evidence of reputation (2).

These declarations of deceased persons as to boundaries or customs, &c. ought to come from persons who had no interest to misrepresent; if they appear to have had any interest to make evidence for themselves or for others, what they said will not be evidence. Any declarations, that they made *post litem motam*, seem not to be admissible (3). But, unless there should appear to be a *lis mota* it will not be enough, for the purpose of excluding their declarations, to show that they claimed themselves under the same custom. This kind of evidence, therefore, has been received on a question of parochial modus, though *the * 184
deceased was a parishioner, and liable to pay tithe (1); so also, on a question of parochial or manorial boundary, although the persons, who had been heard to speak of the boundary, were parishioners, and claimed rights of com-

(1) 1 Maul. & Sel. 687. 689. and see *infra*, p. 194.

(2) 1 Maul. & Sel. 689. 690. 12 East 65. 14 East 330.

(3) See *supra*, p. 179, 180.

(1) Harwood v. Sims, 1 Wightw. 112.

mon on the very wastes, which their declarations had a tendency to enlarge (2).

Although, on a question of boundary or custom, the general opinion of the place is evidence of the general right, yet the tradition of a *particular fact*, (as, that such a turf was dug, or such a post put down in a particular spot, &c.) said to have been done in the exercise of that right, will not be evidence (3); for the fact, which is the subject of tradition, may have been done under a license from the very persons against whom, or against whose privies, &c. the right is afterwards claimed; and, in general, single facts are so frequently misrepresented or misreported, either from intention or from ignorance, and the various circumstances which have accompanied a fact, and which may be essentially characteristic, are often so little known, or, if known, are so likely to pass unobserved, and to be forgotten in the course of time, that no credit can safely be given to such a tradition. Thus, on a question of parochial modus, evidence that a particular person, since deceased, paid a certain sum in lieu of tithes would not be admissible; but if the witness says, he has heard from old inhabitants, that so much per acre was always paid in lieu of the tithes, that will be good evidence; for it does not consist of hearsay of a particular fact, but comes within the general rule of evidence of reputation (4).

Rector's books, old leases, &c.

Entries made by a deceased rector in his book, of the receipt of ecclesiastical dues, have been in several cases admitted as evidence for his successor; because, it is said, *he had no interest to mistate the fact, in making an entry, which could not possibly be evidence for himself (1). "This, as Lord Hardwicke once said (2), is going a great way, but has been allowed, because the parson knows, that his entry cannot benefit either himself or his representative, who has nothing to do with the living; and it is

* 185

(2) Nicholls v. Parker, 14 East, 331; tried before Le Blanc, J. 1805.

(3) 3 T. R. 709. 5 T. R. 123. 14 East 330, 1. 1 Maul. & Sel. 637.

(4) Harwood v. Sims, 1 Wightw. 112.

(1) 7 East 290.

(2) 2 Ves. 43.

not to be presumed, that the parson would make false entries for his successor, who stands indifferent to him*." The cases, however, have gone still further; and similar entries, made by impropriate rectors, have been received as evidence for their successors, although objected to as coming from the owners of the inheritance (3). So, in a case where a question arose between an impropriate rector and a vicar respecting agistment tithe, the Court of Exchequer held, that the books of a lessee of the rectory, stating the receipt of such tithe, were evidence, after the determination of their lease, for the impropriator (4); and entries by the steward of a former owner of the estate, containing an account of payments to the vicar in lieu of the tithes of particular lands, have been admitted as evidence for a succeeding owner against the impropriator (5). In the late case of Perigal v. Nicholson and others (6), on a bill for tithes filed by the vicar against the defendants, who insisted upon a modus for *hay and agistment*, the court of *Exchequer admitted as evidence for the plaintiff, an * 186
entry in the parish register, stating, that various moduses were due from the different townships of the parish for *hay only*, in which entry the sum total of all the moduses was in the hand-writing of a preceding vicar, but it did not appear by whom the other part of the entry had been made. The majority of the court held, as the report states, that the entry was admissible, upon the ground, that the vicar had no interest beyond his incumbency, and there

(3) Anon. case, Bunb. 46. Anon. case, cor. King, C. J. Vin. Ab. Ev. T. b. 73., and T. b. 117., art. 3. Illingworth v. Leigh, 4 Gwill. 1618. Woodnoth v. Ld. Cobham, 2 Gwill. 653; Bunb. 180., S. C.

(4) Illingworth v. Leigh, 4 Gwill. 1618.

(5) Woodnoth v. Lord Cobham, 2 Gwill. 653.

(6) 1 Wightw. 63; Wood B. dissenting.

* Such evidence is said to have been refused in Le Gross v. Levemoor, 2 Gwill. 527; has been mentioned as a singular exception by Ld. Kenyon in Outram v. Morewood, 5 T. R. 123; was disapproved of by Wood B. in Perigal v. Nicholson, 1 Wightw. Rep. 63., also by Price B. in Woodnoth v. Ld. Cobham, 2 Gwill. 653. King, C. J., in a case before him, in 1719, said, this evidence had been received *per cursum Scaccarii*, though he could not give a reason for it; Vin. Ab. Ev. (T. b. 73.)

did not appear to be any dispute at the time, or previously, respecting these tithes; and this entry, by admitting a modus in one article, was in abridgment of the rights of the vicar, and it was the application only which now accidentally became favourable to his successor.

The cases in which rector's books have been received as evidence, in favour of a succeeding rector, against a stranger, appear to be very distinguishable from the cases before cited, in which the declarations or written entries were made by deceased parsons, peculiarly if not exclusively acquainted with the fact. The utmost to be said of these is, that the declarations generally related to old facts, and were made by persons who could not have used them in their own favour; and the same may be said of a great variety of cases, in which the declarations of deceased persons have been uniformly rejected. The objection against hearsay, (under which title such entries must be classed, for with respect to their *admissibility* it is not material, whether the declarations were written or merely spoken), is, not that the person, who asserted the fact, might have been interested to misrepresent it, but that the assertion was made not under the sanction of an oath, and that the party, against whom the evidence is offered, had no opportunity of questioning the person as to the supposed fact. Here the declarations were not *against* the interest of the person who made them, and were produced against a
* 187 stranger; and further, the rights sought to be *established by such declarations were in their nature capable of various other kinds of proof.

Old leases and old rent-rolls have been received in evidence, in favour of a party claiming under the lessors (1). And, on a question, whether certain lands, which had been approved from a waste, were subject to a right of common, several counterparts of old leases kept among the muniments of the lord of the manor, by which the land appeared to have been demised by the lord free from any

(1) Newburgh v. Newburgh, Vin. Ab. "Evidence," T. b. 43. 3 Brown Parl. Cases, 553., last edit. Per Heath, J. in 1 Campb. 309.

such charge, were allowed to be evidence for the plaintiff, who claimed under the lord of the manor, against the defendant in trespass, who justified for common of pasture, though possession under the leases was not shown; the leases being so old, that no person could speak to possession under them (2). So, where the question was, whether the plaintiffs were entitled to a prescriptive right of exclusive fishery in a navigable river, which they claimed under the lords of the manor, they were allowed to give in evidence old entries of licenses on the court rolls of the manor, stating that the lords of the manor had the several fishery, and had granted the liberty of fishing for certain rents; nor was it thought necessary to prove payment under these licenses, as they were of such an ancient date, that evidence of payment could not reasonably be expected (3). The old licenses were, therefore, admitted; but it was added, that they would not be entitled to any weight, unless payment under similar licenses could be proved in later times, or that the lords of the manor had exercised other acts of ownership, which had been acquiesced in.

A survey of a manor or estate, made by the owner, is not evidence against a stranger, in favour of a succeeding owner, that particular lands are parcel of the estate (4). *But a survey, which was delivered by the owner to a purchaser of part of his estate, would be evidence against such former owner and against a purchaser of the other part; as in the case of Bridgman v. Jennings (1), where Lord Holt ruled, that if A. be seized of the manors of B. and C., and during his seisin of both he causes a survey to be taken of the manor of B., and afterwards the manor of B. is conveyed to E., and afterwards there are disputes between the lords of the manors of B. and C. about their boundaries, that this old survey may be given in

* 188

(2) Clarkson v. Woodhouse, 5 T. R. 412 (*a*).

(3) Rogers and others v. Allen, 1 Campb. 309., before Heath, J.

(4) Anon. 1 Str. 95.

(1) 1 Ld. Raym. 734. Gilb. Ev. 70. And see Davies v. Pierce, 2 T. R. 53., cited *supra*, p. 182.

evidence: but it would be otherwise, said Lord Holt, if the two manors had not been in the hands of the same person at the time when the survey was taken. A survey, then, which has been made by a former owner of the estate, is not evidence of the locality or identity of land against any person, who was a mere stranger to the survey (*a*).

So, in the case of Outram v. Morewood (2), (where one of the points to be established was, whether certain lands, described in ancient title deeds, were the same, for which certain rents had been at several times paid), the court of King's Bench determined, that entries, made by a deceased person, under whom the defendant claimed, acknowledging the receipt of rent for the premises in question, were not admissible evidence for the defendant. Lord Kenyon on that occasion said, "This is distinguishable from all the cases cited. . In those, something was produced in respect of the interest of the party; and what the party did or said may be evidence against himself. But here, the entry was a mere private memorandum, to remind the person that he had received the rent, and cannot be admitted to decide the right between these parties. Evidence of this kind can only be admitted to restrain, not to advance, the interests of the party who makes it. What a man does in his closet ought not to affect the rights of third
*189 persons. There is *only one instance in which this is allowed, namely, the books of an incumbent respecting his tithes. But that has been always considered an excepted case." "The general rule, said Lord Hardwicke (1), in the case of Glyn v. The Bank of England is, that a man cannot make evidence for himself. What he writes or says for himself cannot be evidence of his right, and consequently cannot be for his representative claiming in his

(2) 5 T. R. 123. And see Lord Pomfret v. Smith, 7 Brown P. C. 5 T. R. 413. n.

(1) 2 Ves. 43.

(*a*) Vide *Lee* v. *Tapscot*, 2 *Wash.* 276.

right and place. I will not say, (added Lord Hardwicke), how length of time may vary it; but otherwise, it cannot be, any more than for himself."

Hearsay as to *public rights.*

In questions concerning public rights, common reputation is admitted to be evidence; for such rights, being matters of public notoriety and of great local importance, become a continual subject of discussion in those parts of the country, where all have the same means of information and the same interest to ascertain the claim (2). Thus, for example, if a question should be raised, whether a corporation has a prescriptive right to collect tolls on a public navigation, it would be good evidence to show, that deceased persons have been heard to acknowledge the right, and to declare that they had been so informed by their predecessors. The same reason applies, in a less degree, to questions respecting general customs, which concern parishes, or manors, or the inhabitants of towns and other places (3). In such cases, general reputation is some evidence of a right beyond the memory of living witnesses, and thus tends to support the modern usage (*a*).

Hearsay as to *private rights.*

With respect to the admissibility of common reputation, as evidence of prescriptive rights strictly *private*, there has been considerable doubt. In one of the latest cases on this subject (4), where, on a motion for a new trial, the *question was, whether such evidence ought to have been received, as evidence of a prescriptive right of digging stones on a waste, the Court of King's Bench was equally divided. A book of authority lays it down broadly, that "in questions of prescription it is allowable to give hearsay

* 190

(2) Morewood v. Wood, 14 East 329. See Weeks v. Sparke, 1 Maul. & Sel. 679. 685.

(3) 14 East 327. See *supra*, p. 183.

(4) Morewood v. Wood, 14 East 327. Ld. Kenyon, C. J. and Ashurst, J. against the evidence; Buller J. and Grose, J. for it.

(*a*) Where no act of incorporation could be proved, of a parish which had existed more than forty years, the court admitted proof of its incorporation, by reputation. *Dillingham* v. *Snow et al.* 5 *Mass. Rep.* 547.

evidence, in order to prove general reputation: and that, therefore, where the issue was on a right of way over the plaintiff's close, the defendants were admitted to give evidence of a conversation between persons not interested, then dead, wherein the right to the way was acknowledged (1)." But, on the other side, there are many great authorities against receiving this kind of evidence (2). And there appears to be good reason for the distinction. For, where individuals claim merely a *private* right, other people have not the same means of knowing it, nor, if they had, would they have the same interest to examine it. How, for instance, can the common belief among the inhabitants of a parish supply any kind of information, on a question of right of way claimed by an individual over a particular field (3)? In such cases, common reputation appears to give no satisfactory information, and to be inapplicable to the point in issue. In the case of Weeks v. Sparke (4), the last reported case on this subject, which was an action for a trespass on the plaintiff's close, *parcel of a common*, &c. the defendant justified for a prescriptive right of common at all times over the place, &c.; and the plaintiff in his replication prescribed to use the place for tillage, &c. qualifying the defendant's general right; to support this prescriptive right of tillage, the plaintiff offered evidence of reputation, which was received at the
*191 *trial; and the Court of King's Bench were of opinion, that it had been properly admitted, on the ground that the right claimed by the plaintiff, although claimed by prescription, yet was an abridgment of the general right of

(1) Bull. N. P. 295. And see the opinions of Buller, J. and Grose, J. in Morewood v. Wood, 14 East 330. n.; 3 T. R. 709. See also Webb v. Petts, Noy 44., where the court agreed that proof by hearsay, of a modus for a particular farm, was admissible.

(2) Lord Kenyon in Reed v. Jackson, 1 East 357. Lord Kenyon and Ashurst, J. in Morewood v. Wood, 14 East 329. Lord Kenyon in Withnell v. Gartham, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 324. See also Clothier v. Chapman, 14 East 331. n. before Graham B.; Didsbury v. Thomas, 14 East 323; Barnes v. Mawson, 1 Maul. & Sel. 81.

(3) See 1 Maul. & Sel. 691.

(4) 1 Maul. & Sel. 679. See City of London v. Clerke, Carth. 181.

common over the waste, and affected a large number of occupiers within the district.

It has been said, indeed, that in the case of the Bp. of Meath v. Lord Belfield (1) in a quare impedit, after the plaintiff had given in evidence an entry, in the register of the diocese, of the institution of one K, (in which entry there was a blank, where the patron's name is usually inserted,) parol evidence of the general reputation of the country was offered, that K was in by the presentation of one, under whom Lord Belfield claimed; and that, upon a bill of exceptions, this evidence was adjudged to be admissible, on the ground that a presentation may be by parol, and what commences by parol may be transmitted to posterity by parol, and that this creates a general reputation. But Lord Kenyon adverting to this case in the case of the King v. Eriswell (2), said, he admitted that a presentation might be by parol, and might be proved by parol, that is, by a witness who was present and heard it; but he denied, that in such a case common reputation could be given in evidence. If it can, he added, why might not such evidence decide titles to estates, at least before the statute of frauds, when no written instrument was required to make a good feoffment of the greatest landed property in the kingdom.

Declarations *against interest.*

The declarations of deceased persons have also been admitted, in cases where they appear to be made against their interest; as, entries in their books, charging themselves with the receipt of money on the account of a *third person (1), or acknowledging the payment of money due to themselves (2). In either case, the entry is to their own immediate prejudice, and strong evidence of the fact, in consideration of which the money is said to have been

* 192

(1) Bull. N. P. 295., and cited by Buller, J. in K. v. Eriswell, 3 T. R. 719.

(2) 3 T. R. 723.

(1) Barry v. Bebbington, 4 T. R. 515. Harpur v. Brooke, 3 Woodeson, Lect. 332. Stead v. Heaton, 4 T. R. 669.

(2) Warren v. Greenville, 2 Str. 1129., commented on by Lord Mansfield in Brydges v. Duchess of Chandos, 2 Burr. 1072., and by Ld. Ellenborough in Higham v. Ridgway, 10 East 118. Doe dem. Reece and others v. Robson and another, 15 East 33.

received or paid. Thus, where the point in issue was, whether a certain waste was the soil of the defendant, entries by a steward, since deceased, of money received by him from different persons in satisfaction of trespasses committed on the waste, are evidence to show that the right to the soil was in his master, under whom the plaintiff claimed (3). So rentals in which a deceased bailiff or receiver charges himself with specified sums, are evidence to show for what particular tenure, or in what right the money was received (4). So, a bill of lading, signed by the deceased master of a vessel, for goods to be delivered to a consignee, is evidence of property in the consignee, not only against the master, but also, as it seems, in an action of trover for the goods against a third person (5). So, a written memorandum by a deceased man-midwife, stating that he had delivered a woman of a child on a certain day, and referring to his ledger, in which a charge for his attendance was marked as paid, was thought by the Court of King's Bench to have been properly received in evidence, upon an issue as to the child's age (6). This entry was made by a person, who, so far from having an interest to make them, had an interest the other way. For, it appeared distinctly, from other evidence, that the work charged was actually done; and the discharge in the book repels the claim, which he would otherwise have had (*a*).

(3) Barry v. Bebbington, 4 T. R. 515.

(4) Harpur v. Brooke, 3 Woodeson's Lect. 332. Vin. Ab. "Evidence," (A. b. 15.) 13.

(5) Haddow v. Parry, 3 Taunt. 305.

(6) Higham v. Ridgway, 10 East 109, 110.

(*a*) In an action for money paid, by the surety in a bond given to the United States for duties, against his principal, it was held that the possession of the bond and the collector's receipt, were evidence of payment by the surety, as the collector would be liable, on the receipt, for the amount, to the United States. *Sluby* v. *Champlin*, 4 *Johns. Rep.* 461. A receipt given by a counsel, who was deceased, for bonds which he had received to sue upon

*Upon the same principle, in a late case, in an action of ejectment by the first tenant in tail under a settlement (by which an estate was limited to A. for life, remainder to B. for life, remainder to C. his eldest son for life, remainder to C.'s eldest son in tail, &c., with a power to the tenants for life to grant leases on condition of reserving the ancient rent) against the defendant who claimed as lessee of C., to recover a part of the estate, which, as the lessor of the plaintiff complained, had been demised for less than the ancient rent, the Court of King's Bench held, that a letter, addressed to B., by one intimately acquainted with the property, purporting to be a particular account of the ancient rents at that time, and recognized as such by B., and preserved by the successive owners of the estate, ought to have been received at the trial, as evidence of the ancient reserved rent against C., (a succeeding tenant for life, subject to the restrictions of the same power,) and also against the defendant claiming under C. This old paper, so accredited and adopted, was considered to be equivalent to a declaration by B. himself. Lord Ellenborough, in delivering the judgment of the Court, said, "The contents of the paper were adverse to the title of the person who had possession of it, by diminishing the interest in the fine on renewal, in the same proportion as it raised the rent to be reserved. Then at such a distance of time, with the means of knowledge which he had of the fact, and his interest in declaring it the other way, we think that his declaration is evidence of the fact to go to the jury (1)."

(1) Roe d. Brune v. Rawlins, 7 East 279. 290. See also the following cases, in which declarations of deceased persons, against their interest, were received in evidence; Baggalley v. Jones, 1 Campb. 367; Morewood v. Wood, 14 East 328; Doe d. Reece v. Robson, 15 East 33; Price v. Littlewood, 3 Campb. 288. Searle v. Ld. Barrington, *supra*, p. 115. And as to declarations by persons *jointly interested* see *supra*, p. 72.

---

was admitted as evidence of the time when they were received. *Alston* v. *Taylor*, 1 *Hayw.* 395. The acknowledgment of a deceased person who was competent to charge himself by an ordinary receipt or acquittance, was admitted as evidence that he had

So, where the question was, whether some horses, which had been taken by the defendant under a heriot custom, belonged to the plaintiff or to one A. B., a deceased tenant of the defendant, declarations by A. B. were
* 194 offered *in evidence, for the purpose of proving that the horses belonged to the plaintiff before A. B.'s death, in which declarations A. B. stated that he had given up his farm and all his stock to the plaintiff. This evidence was rejected at the trial; but the Court of Common Pleas, on a motion for a new trial, held that the declarations ought to have been admitted, since they were against the interest of the person who made them, and might have been given in evidence against him in his life-time, if the plaintiff had brought an action for the horses (1) (*a*).

Upon the same principle, a paper signed by many deceased copyholders of a manor, importing what was the general right of common in each copyholder, and agreeing to restrict it, is evidence of reputation even against other copyholders not claiming under those who signed it (2). So, a declaration by the owner or occupier of adjoining land, that his neighbour's land extends to such a spot, accompanying an act of forbearance to go beyond the spot for that reason, (or without such act, if he speaks against his interest,) is evidence that the land extends so far (3). So, the declaration of a deceased occupier of land, that he rented it under a certain person, is evidence of that person's seisin (4). Such admissions or declarations against

(1) Ivat v. Finch, 1 Taunt. Rep. 141.

(2) Chapman v. Cowlan, 13 East 10.

(3) Sir T. Stanley v. White, 14 East 332. 339. 341.

(4) Uncle v. Watson, 4 Taunt. 16. see *supra*, p. 182. Doe dem. Baggalley v. Jones, 1 Campb. 367.

---

received money from the plaintiff for the defendant's use. *Holladay* v. *Littlepage*, 2 *Mun.* 316.

(*a*) Subsequent declarations by a party to a sale or transfer of property, which go to take away a vested right, are not admissible evidence. *Phœnix* v. *Day & others*, 5 *Johns. Rep.* 412. Vide 2 *Hawy.* 134. 330.

interest appear to be evidence upon the same principle, as the acts of a party against his interest; they differ in degree and in their effect, rather than in their nature. An act of forbearance on one side is an admission of right on the other; and proof of the exercise of a right, which has been acquiesced in, is still stronger evidence that the right exists. It is the constant practice to receive such evidence on questions concerning tolls, rights of way, freehold in wastes, and other cases of the same kind (5).

*The memorandum or entry, before it can be received in evidence, must be proved to be authentic; as, by showing it to be the hand-writing of the deceased person, who knew the fact there stated, or that it was signed by him (1): or, (if signed by another,) that it was made by his order, or afterwards acknowledged by him. And as to the question, whether a book produced was a receiver's book, that may be determined by internal evidence, on an inspection by the Court (2). * 195

In all the cases which have been mentioned on this subject, the person, who had made the entry or declaration in question, was deceased at the time of the trial: if the rule were not confined to such cases, there would be great danger of collusion. It has, therefore, been held, that such evidence is not admissible where the person is incapable of attending from illness (3).

Tradesman's book.

Entries in the books of a tradesman by his deceased shopman, who therein supplies proof of a charge against himself, have been admitted on the same principle to be evidence of the delivery of goods, or of other matter there stated within his own knowledge (*a*). Thus, in an action

(5) 1 Str. 659. 14 East 342. 1 Campb. 310.

(1) 4 T. R. 515, 516. Jones v. Waller, 3 Gwill. 847. Yate v. Leigh, 3 Gwill. 861.

(2) Doe d. Webber v. Lord G. Thynne, 10 East 206. 4 T. R. 516.

(3) Harrison v. Blades, 3 Campb. 457.

(*a*) Vide *Lewis* v. *Norton*, 1 *Wash.* 76. It is only in case of the death of the clerk that the entries can be admitted on proving his hand-writing; although, if living, he may be out of the jurisdiction

of assumpsit, the usual course of the plaintiff's dealings appeared to be, that the draymen of the plaintiff, who was a brewer, should come every night to the clerk of the brewhouse, and give him an account of the beer delivered out by them, which he set down in a book kept for the purpose, and the draymen signed it; the drayman, who signed the particular entry offered in evidence, had since died, but his hand-writing was proved; and this entry was held to be good evidence of the delivery of the beer, for which the action was brought (4). This declaration of the
*196 *tradesman's servant, of having delivered the goods, is also an admission, that he received them for that purpose, and would have been evidence against him, in an action for not delivering them according to his instructions. But it is clearly distinguishable from entries in the book of a receiver, who by making a gratuitous charge against himself, knowingly against his own interest, and without any equivalent, repels every supposition of fraud. A disposition to commit fraud would have tempted him to suppress altogegether the fact of his having received any thing, or to misrepresent the amount of the sum, but not to mis-state the ground or consideration for which it was received; that is,

(4) Price v. Ld. Torrington, 1 Salk. 285; 2 Ld. Ray. 873., S. C. And see Pitman v. Madox, 2 Salk. 690; Calvert v. Archbishop of Canterbury, 2 Esp. N. P. C. 645; Philipson v. Chase, 2 Campb. 110; Hagedorn v. Reid, 3 Campb. 379.

---

of the court. *Cooper* v. *Marsden*, 1 *Esp. Rep.* 1. *Kennedy* v. *Fairman*, 1 *Hawy.* 458. *Fenno* v. *Rogers & M'Bride*, 1 *Bay* 480. In an action for a watch delivered to a watchmaker to be cleaned, the servant having sworn that he saw his master deliver it to a third person by the owner's orders, and such third person having sworn that he never received it, Lord Kenyon permitted the master's daybook containing an entry made by himself at the time, in the ordinary course of business to be read in confirmation of the servant's testimony. *Digby* v. *Stedman*, 1 *Esp. Rep.* 329. In *Brown* v. *Brown*, 2 *Wash.* 151. an entry made by an administrator since dead, was, with other circumstances, permitted to be given in evidence.

not to mis-state the only fact sought to be established by the proposed evidence. On the other hand, the declaration of the tradesman's servant is offered in evidence to prove the fact of delivery, and as he gives the account not against his own interest, (which is some security for the truth of the statement in the other case,) the probability of his account being true or false is neither greater nor less than the probability of his being honest or dishonest, which is nothing more than may be said in every case of hearsay. The circumstance of his thereby acknowledging the receipt of goods, which, it may be said, would be evidence in an action against him, seems to amount to little or nothing. It was the least he could say: to have said nothing at all, would, as he must have known, necessarily lead to some inquiry. These considerations may serve to show how cautiously such declarations by shopmen are to be admitted in evidence, to charge third persons with the receipt of goods; more particularly, as the tradesman may easily be furnished with evidence of delivery, by taking a memorandum from the purchaser, or by requiring some other security.

In the case of Evans and Lake (1), a merchant's books were received in evidence under particular circumstances. The question there was, whether certain goods, which had been bought in the name of Mr. Lake, were purchased on *his own account, or in trust for Sir Stephen Evans. To * 197
prove the latter of these positions, the assignees of Sir Stephen Evans, who were the plaintiffs, first showed, that there was no entry in the books of Mr. Lake relating to this transaction; they then produced several receipts in the possession of Sir S. Evans for the payment of part of the goods, and on the back of the receipts there was a reference in the hand-writing of Sir Stephen's book-keeper, since deceased, to a certain shop-book of Sir Stephen. Upon this, the question was, whether the book so referred to, in which was an entry for the payment of

(1) Bull. N. P. 282, 283; and see Cooper v. Marsden, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 1.

money for the whole of the goods, should be read. And the Court of King's Bench on a trial at bar admitted the entry, not only as to the part mentioned in the receipts, but also as to the remainder of the goods then in the hands of Mr. Lake's son. In this case, (which Ld. Hardwicke (1) has observed upon, as "new and having gone a great way,") the entry was not offered by the assignees, as evidence of payment against the seller of the goods, but as corroborating evidence to show, that while the books of the other party concerned took no notice whatever of the goods, those of Sir S. Evans, under whom the plaintiffs claimed, treated the goods as bought on his account.

In another case, where the plaintiff, to prove delivery of wine to the defendant, produced a book belonging to his cooper, since dead, whose name was subscribed to several articles, which it was proposed to read after proof of the hand-writing, Lord Raymond, C. J. would not allow it, saying it differed from Lord Torrington's case (2).*

* 198 *And Lord Kenyon ruled, in the case of Calvert v. Archbishop of Canterbury (1), that, in an action for the hire of a pair of horses, an entry by the plaintiff's servant, since dead, stating the terms of the agreement with the defendant, ought not to be admitted.

In an action by a tavern-keeper (2), it appeared, that the defendant belonged to a club, which was held at the plaintiff's house, and that in a room, where the club met,

(1) In Glyn v. Bk. of England, 2 Ves. 43.
(2) Clerk v. Bedford, Bull. N. P. 282.

(1) 2 Esp. N. P. C. 646.
(2) Wiltzie v. Adamson, K. B. Sitt. after Mich. term 1789, MS.

* See the case of Cooper v. Marsden, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 1., where, in order to prove payment of a draft at a banker's, the banking-house book was offered in evidence, in which book there was an entry of the payment of the draft in question. Lord Kenyon ruled, that the entry could only be proved by the clerk who made it, if living; and that other proof was not admissible, though he might be abroad. According to the report of this case, no objection seems to have been taken against the admissibility of the entry itself, on the ground of its being found in a third person's book; nor does that point appear to have been noticed.

a book used regularly to be kept open, in which the plaintiff's servants entered the articles, as they were ordered by the members of the club, who had thereby an opportunity of inspecting and correcting the account. Lord Kenyon admitted the book as evidence of the delivery, though it was not proved that the servants, who made the entry, were dead, nor was their absence accounted for, and only their hand-writing was proved. The daily account in the book was in this case considered as tantamout to a bill delivered and admitted by the defendant.

The stat. 7 J. 1. c. 12. enacts, that the shop-book of a tradesman shall not be evidence in any action for wares delivered or work done, above one year before the bringing of the action, except the tradesman or his executor shall have obtained a bill of debt or obligation of the debtor for the said debt, or shall have brought against him some action, within a year next after the delivery of the wares, or the work done. And the 2d section provides, that nothing in the act shall extend to the mutual trading and merchandise between tradesman and tradesman. At the time of making this act of parliament, there was an opinion growing up, that, after a certain length of time, a man's shop-books should be evidence for him, after the year: to prevent which, the act was made (3). However the book is not evidence, even within the year, except under particular *circumstances. An entry made by a tradesman himself, stating the delivery of goods, is not evidence for him; but, whether made by him or not, it may often serve as a memorandum to refresh the memory of the shopman, and for that purpose is admissible (*a*). * 199

(3) Per Ld. Hardwicke, 2 Ves. 43.

(*a*) In a suit in chancery *between* partners, the books of the partnership are evidence, and vouchers as to the particular items are unnecessary. *Fletcher* v. *Pollard*, 2 *Hen. & Mun.* 544. *Brickhouse* v. *Hunter & others*, 4 *Hen. & Mun.* 363.

Shop-books are admitted in many of the states as evidence of goods sold and delivered, or of work and labour. How far they

It has been already stated, that admissions by one of the parties to a suit, against his interest, are evidence against him; and that statements made by a third person, on being referred to by a party respecting any litigated

---

are competent evidence, in the state of Massachusetts, will appear from the opinion of the judges in the case of *Cogswell* v. *Dolliver*, 2 *Mass. Rep.* 217. Sewall, J. says; "In actions of *assumpsit* for goods sold and delivered, evidence by a shop-book or other daily memoranda, with the supplementary oath of the party himself, if living, is a mode of proof admitted with us generally, and is made necessary by the course of business in transactions of that nature.—Books offered as evidence may be rejected by the court as incompetent, or when admitted may be treated as unworthy of credit. I recollect but two sorts of objections which have been allowed against books as rendering them *incompetent* evidence. To be admitted in evidence, they must appear to contain the first entries or charges by the party, made at or near the time of the transaction to be proved; and when the contrary is discernable upon the face of the book, or comes out upon the examination of the party, they ought to be rejected as incompetent evidence. Fraudulent appearances or circumstances, such as material and gross alterations, false additions, &c. are also objections to the competency of the book, in which they are discoverable, or against which they may be proved in any manner. Objections to the *credit* of books admitted in evidence are of various kinds, which there is no occasion to enumerate. The method in which the book has been kept, as when the charges to be proved have been entered to a particular account, like the entries of a ledger, and not like those of a daybook, is an objection to the credit of the book." Sedgwick, J. "It is to be lamented that it is necessary in this country to resort to evidence of this kind, as it opens a door and furnishes a temptation to much mischief. Where a book is offered in evidence it ought to appear suited to aid the oath of the party, which it is brought to fortify and confirm. The court are to judge of its competency to be admitted in evidence, and the jury are to decide on the credit which may be due to it. The true ground of admitting the books of the party in evidence, as a foundation for the suppletory evidence of the oath of the party, I have always understood to be *that the judge or court before whom the case*

point (1), or representations by a party's agent (2), are in many cases admissible against the principal. To such cases the objection of hearsay does not apply. Nor does the objection apply to the account which has been given by a witness on a former trial, or to dying declarations.

(1) See ante, p. 77. (2) See ante, p. 74.

---

is tried, should, on inspection, determine that the book was proper for that purpose, and that such determination renders it competent evidence." In *Prime* v. *Smith*, 4 *Mass. Rep.* 455., Sewall, J. observes, that "in actions of assumpsit for articles delivered, or for work and labour performed, the admission of proof by the book of the plaintiff himself, appearing to be in his own hand-writing, and supported by his supplementary oath, is a practice, in the extent to which it has been carried, peculiar to *New England*, if not confined to this state. But it is a practice, which has been long established, and seems to have arisen upon the most reasonable grounds, out of the necessity of the case, and a conformity to the actual state of things.—There are however obvious difficulties and hazards attending this mode of proof; and it ought not to be extended by any new precedent. Every memorandum of a shop-keeper or labourer is not to be admitted as his book. It is essential to this kind of evidence that the charges appearing in the hand-writing of the party, are in such a state that they may be presumed to have been his daily minutes of his business and transactions, in which regard is had to the degree of education of the party, the nature of his employment, and to the manner of his charges against other persons. Where this appearance is wanting, and the presumption cannot be made, the evidence has been usually rejected as incompetent. And when, having this appearance, a plaintiff's books or memorandums are admitted, the evidence remains liable to every objection, which may be suggested, from unfair appearances in the statement of the particular account in issue, or from the whole book or minutes taken together, and which materially affect the credibility of the evidence." It has been held that when an account was transferred from the ledger to the daybook, the ledger should be produced, that the other party may have advantage of any items entered therein to his credit. *Prince's Exr.* v. *Swett*, 2 *Mass. Rep.* 569.

In Connecticut in the statutory action of book-debt (vide laws

Testimony on former trial.

If a witness, who has been examined in a former action between the same parties, and where the point in issue was the same as in the second action, is since dead, what he swore at the trial, may be proved by one who heard

---

of Connecticut, tit. 25. c. 1.) books of accounts are admitted in evidence. In this action the statute allows of the oath of the party, and it is confined to such articles as are usually charged on book: and the book ought to be kept in a fair and regular manner, and the articles truly entered at the time of the delivery, or the performance of the service, so as to be consistent with and support the oath of the party: for the book is to be considered the essential part of the evidence, and the oath of the party as supplementary to it. *Swift's Ev.* 81. A party is not compellable to produce the original book of entries, but may go to trial on a transcript, but the non-production of the original books is a circumstance tending to discredit the party's account. Merchants and traders should produce their daybooks and ledgers, and mechanics, where business requires that mode of keeping accounts. Their books should appear to be regularly kept, and the entries fairly made at the time, and from day to day in the usual course of their business. Where people make single entries only, the account should be fair and properly dated. Where the books are not regularly kept—where there appear to be rasures, alterations, interlineations, and additions; and where the accounts are made out after a dispute has arisen, there is a strong presumption against this truth, and the party must have other proof to corroborate his testimony to entitle him to recover. *Id.* 82. See further as to the nature of the action of book-debt. *Bradley* v. *Goodyear*, 1 *Day* 104.

In Pennsylvania, from the peculiar situation of the country, shop-books, proved by the oath of the plaintiff, are admitted in evidence to charge the original debtor, but not a person who has undertaken to pay for goods delivered to another. *Poultney et al.* v. *Ross*, 1 *Dall.* 238. Where the book is in the hand-writing of a clerk it must be proved by him, if living and within the jurisdiction of the court. In consideration, says Tilghman, Ch. J. of the mode of doing business in the infancy of the country, when many people kept their *own books*, it has been permitted, from the necessity of the case, to offer these books in evidence. But when no such necessity exists, when the fact is that clerks have been employed and

him give evidence (3). For such evidence was not given in an extrajudicial manner, but upon oath. The parties to the suit were the same, the point in issue was the same, and an opportunity was given for cross-examination.

(3) Per Cur. in R. v. Carpenter, 2 Show. 47. Buckworth's case, Sir T. Raym. 170. Vin. Ab. "Evidence," (T. b. 88.), pl. 4. Coker v. Farewell, 2 P. Will. 563. Pike v. Crouch, 1 Ld. Ray. 730. Per Lord Kenyon, 4 T. R. 290. Mayor of Doncaster v. Day, 3 Taunt. 262.

---

the entries made by *them*, there is no cause for violating that wise principle, that no man shall be allowed to give testimony for himself. *Sterret* v. *Bull & others*, 1 *Binney* 234. Et vide *Miflin et al.* v. *Bingham*, 1 *Dall.* 272. *Seagrove* v. *Redman et al.* 4 *Dall.* 153. *Rodman et al.* v. *Hoop's Exr.* 1 *Dall.* 85.

Books of account, sworn to by the plaintiff, are evidence in South Carolina, by statute. *Foster* v. *Sinkler*, 1 *Bay* 40. *Slade* v. *Teasdale*, 2 *Bay* 172.

This species of evidence has been sanctioned, under certain restrictions, by a late decision of the Supreme Court of the state of New-York; the rule and the limitations of it, will appear from the opinion of the court, which was as follows: "The only point for our consideration is, whether the evidence in support of the plaintiff's demand, in the court below, was admissible. In *Case* v. *Potter*, (8 *Johns. Rep.* 212.) the question how far the books of account of a party were evidence, incidentally came under consideration; but as there was sufficient proof, in that case, to sustain the verdict without the books, there was no direct decision on the point. Cases are there cited, showing that by the English law tradesmen's books are not legal evidence in favour of the party making the entries; and we intimated that such proof is tolerated here, from the usage which has crept in, and the difficulty of giving proof in many cases, of a sale and delivery in the usual course of business. In a case like the present, it is believed that the usage and necessity of admitting such proof, has been so long sanctioned and felt in our courts of justice, that it is now too late to question the admissibility of it. The admission of books of account in evidence, under proper limitations and restrictions, is not calculated to excite alarm, or to produce injurious consequences. They are not evidence of money lent. This was so held in *Case* v. *Potter*, because such transactions are not, in the usual course of business, matter of book account. They are not evidence in the case of a

These circumstances plainly distinguish the proposed evidence from hearsay (*b*). So, where a person, who had been sworn on a former trial between the same parties on the same issue, and subpœnaed to appear as witness at a second trial, did not appear in obedience to the writ, the Court of King's Bench, seeing reason to believe that he had been kept away by the contrivance of the adverse party, admitted other witnesses to prove what he had sworn on the former occasion (4). The person called to prove what a
* 200 deceased witness *said, must undertake to repeat precisely his very words, and not merely to swear to their effect (1). Thus, in a case before Lord Kenyon, a witness was not allowed to speak to the effect of what a deceased witness had sworn on a former trial. "He ought," said Lord Kenyon, "to recollect the very words; for the jury alone can judge of the effect of words (2)." And he cited the case of the King v. Deborah, from one of his own notes, to the same point (*a*). For the purpose of intro-

(4) Green v. Gaturck, Bull. N. P. 243.

(1) Ld. Palmerstone's case, cited by Lord Kenyon in R. v. Joliffe, 4 T. R. 290.

(2) Ennis v. Donisthorn, Cornw. Sum. Ass. 1789, MS.

---

single charge, because there exists in such case no evidence of regular dealing between the parties. They ought not to be admitted where there are several charges, unless a foundation is first laid for their admission, by proving that the party had no clerk, that some of the articles charged have been delivered, that the books produced are the account books of the party, and that he keeps fair and honest accounts, and this by those who have dealt and settled with him. Under these restrictions, from the necessity of the case, and the consideration that the party debited, is shown to have reposed confidence, by dealing with and being intrusted by the other party, they are evidence for the consideration of a jury." Platt, J. dissented and stated his reasons at length. *Vosburgh* v. *Thayer*, 12 *Johns. Rep.* 461.

(*b*) Vide *Jackson d. Gillespy & others* v. *Woolsey*, 11 *Johns. Rep.* 446. *Pegram* v. *Isabell*, 2 *Hen. & Mun.* 193.

(*a*) The testimony of a deceased witness before commissioners

ducing an account of what a deceased witness swore on the first trial, the nisi prius record and the postea indorsed are good evidence to show, that a cause was brought on for trial, or that it was actually tried (3) (*b*).

Dying declarations.

The dying declarations of a person, who has received a mortal injury, are constantly admitted in criminal prosecutions, and are not liable to the common objection against hearsay evidence (4). The principle of this exception to the general rule is founded partly on the awful situation of the dying person, which is considered to be as powerful over his conscience as the obligation of an oath, and partly on a supposed absence of interest on the verge of the next world, which dispenses with the necessity of

(3) Pitton v. Walter, 1 Str. 162. Cr. C. 566. Bambridge's case, 9 St. Tr. 161.

(4) R. v. Reason and Tranter, 1 Str. 499. Woodcock's case, 2 Leach

---

vested with certain judicial powers, in a proceeding in which the party might have had the benefit of a cross-examination, proved by one of the commissioners in a subsequent trial between the same parties, was held admissible evidence. It does not appear that any record of the proceedings of the commissioners was produced, or that the pendency of the proceedings before them was proved, otherwise than by the testimony of the commissioner. *Jackson d. Potter & Calvin* v. *Bailey*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 17. Evidence of what was sworn to by a deceased witness, on a question of bail, was held inadmissible on the trial of the cause. *Jackson et al.* v. *Winchester*, 4 *Dall.* 205. The notes of the judge who presided at a former trial are not evidence of what was then sworn to. *Miles* v. *O'Hara*, 4 *Binney* 108. Where a prisoner had procured a witness to go away, evidence of what he had testified before the grand jury was admitted. *Rex* v. *Barber*, 1 *Root* 76.

(*b*) The better opinion seems to be, that if the testimony of what a witness swore at a former trial, be unaccompanied with the *postea* or record of the former suit, and that be made an objection, at the time, to the admission of such testimony, the objection is good. *Beals* v. *Guernsey*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 451. But if the objection be not then made it will be presumed that the pendency of the former trial was admitted. *White* v. *Kibling*, 11 *Johns. Rep.* 128.

cross-examination. But before such declarations can be admitted in evidence against a prisoner, it must be satisfactorily proved, that the deceased, at the time of making them, was conscious of his danger, and had given up all hope of recovery (*c*). This consciousness of approaching death may be collected either from the circumstances of the case, (as, from the nature of the wound and the state of body), or from expressions used by the deceased (5). And it has been decided by all the judges, that the question, whether the deceased made the declarations under
* 201 the apprehension of *death, is a question for the judge to determine, not for the jury (1).

On the same principle, the dying declarations of an accomplice are admissible; for the accomplice himself would have been a competent witness, if he had been living. This was determined by all the judges in Margaret Tinkler's case (2). The greater part of the judges were of opinion in this case, that the declarations of the deceased were alone sufficient evidence to convict the prisoner; on the ground, that they were not to be considered as evidence coming from a particeps criminis, as she thought herself dying at the time, and had no view or interest to serve in excusing herself, or fixing the charge unjustly on others. But others of the judges held, that her declarations were to be so considered, and therefore, required the aid of confirmatory evidence. The declarations of a criminal at the time of his execution cannot be received on the trial of an accomplice; for, after attainder, he could not be sworn as a witness (3).

(5) Woodcock's case, 2 Leach Cr. C. 566. Dingler's case, ib. 638. John's case, 1 East Pl. Cr. 357.

(1) By the opinion of all the Judges, in John's case, 1 East Pl. Cr. 357., and in Welborn's case, 1 East Pl. Cr. 359. In Woodcock's case, which was before the two last, this question had been left to the jury by Eyre, C. B., 1 East Pl. Cr. 360.

(2) 1 East Pl. Cr. 354. 6.

(3) Drummond's case, 1 Leach Cr. C. 378; 1 East Pl. Cr. 353., S. C.

(*c*) Declarations made the day after receiving the wound, and six or seven weeks before the death of the deceased were held inadmissible. *State* v. *Moody*, 2 *Hayw.* 31.

The same kind of evidence is admissible in civil cases, as well as in trials for murder (*a*). Thus, the declaration of a person, who, having set his name as subscribing witness to a bond, in his dying moments begged pardon of Heaven for having been concerned in forging the bond, was admitted to be evidence of the forgery by Mr. Justice Heath (4), on the authority of Wright on the demise of Clymer v. Littler (5), where similar evidence of a dying confession by a subscribing witness to a will had been received by Chief Justice Willes, and afterwards approved by the Court of King's Bench. Lord Mansfield on that occasion said, *"The account was a confession of great iniquity, and as the dying person could be under no temptation to say it, but to do justice and ease his conscience, I am of opinion the evidence was proper to be left to the jury."

Contra Johns. Reports 15. 280

* 202

As the declarations of a dying man are admitted, on a supposition, that in his awful situation on the confines of a future world, he had no motives to misrepresent, but on the contrary the strongest motives to speak without disguise and without malice, it seems to follow, that the party, against whom they are produced in evidence, may enter into the particulars of his behaviour in his last moments, or may be allowed to show that the deceased was not of such a character as was likely to be impressed by a religious sense of his approaching dissolution (*b*).

Hearsay is often admitted in evidence, as part of the *res gesta;* the meaning of which seems to be, that where it is necessary, in the course of a cause, to inquire into the nature of a particular act, and the intention of the person

Hearsay part of *res gesta.*

(4) Cited by Ld. Ellenborough in Aveson v. Lord Kinnaird, 6 East 195.

(5) 3 Burr. 1244. 1255.

(*a*) Vide ante, 181.

(*b*) Evidence of the declarations of a testator, on his death-bed, that the will had been obtained from him by duress, is inadmissible to defeat the will. *Jackson d. Coe & others* v. *Kniffen*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 31.

who did the act, proof of what the person said at the time of doing it is admissible evidence, for the purpose of showing its true character. Thus, for example, in an action by the assigness of a bankrupt, the bankrupt's declarations at the time of his absenting himself from home are properly received in evidence, to show the motive of his absence. In the case of Bateman v. Bailey (1), therefore, where the question was, whether the trader's departure from his dwelling-house amounted to an act of bankruptcy, the Court of King's Bench were of opinion, that the reasons, which he gave for his absence, after his return home, ought to have been admitted in explanation of his own act. The words of the stat. 1 J. 1. c. 15. s. 2. are, that every person using the trade of merchandise, &c., who shall begin to keep his house, or otherwise absent himself, or *depart his *dwelling-house, to the intent* or whereby his creditors shall or may be defeated or delayed for the recovery of their past debts, &c., shall be accounted and adjudged a bankrupt.

* 203

In the case of Thompson and wife against Trevanion (1), which was an action of trespass and assault, Lord C. J. Holt allowed what the wife said, immediately upon the hurt received, and before she had time to devise or contrive any thing for her own advantage, to be given in evidence. So, on an indictment for a rape, what the girl said recently after the fact, (so that it excluded a possibility of practising on her), has been held to be admissible in evidence, as a part of the transaction (2). So, in the case of Aveson v. Lord Kinnaird (3), where, (in order to ascertain whether the deceased was in a good state of health on the day of the insurance, it became material to consider what the state of health was both before and after that day), the account, which the deceased gave some

(1) 5 T. R. 512. And see Mayhin v. Eyloe, 2 Str. 809. Ewens v. Gold, Bull. N. P. 40.

(1) Skin. 402., cited by the court, 6 East 193.

(2) Brazier's case, 1 East Pl. Cr. 444.

(3) 6 East 188. 198; ante, p. 181.

days after obtaining the certificate of good health, respecting her state on the former day, was admitted at the trial, and the Court of King's Bench were of opinion, that it had been properly admitted. And it is in every day's experience, said Mr. Justice Lawrence, in this case, that what a man has said of himself to his surgeon is evidence, in an action of assault, to show what he has suffered by reason of the assault. So, it should seem, in an action for criminal conversation, the declarations of a wife at the time of her elopement, stating the reason of her eloping, (as, that she fled from an immediate fear of personal violence), would be evidence against the husband (4); but a collateral declaration, respecting a matter which happened at another time, would not be admissible. And where, in an action for criminal conversation, the defence was, that the plaintiff had connived at his wife's elopement, evidence was received, on the part of the *plaintiff, of the wife's declarations as to her intention and purpose in going (1); for the question, in effect, was, whether the husband knew that she was about to elope, or whether he believed that her intention was as she represented. *204

(4) 6 East 193.

(1) Hoare v. Allen, 3 Esp. N. P. C. 276., before Lord Kenyon, on 2d trial, who said, that some of the Judges, on the motion for a new trial, were of opinion, that this evidence ought to be admitted.

CHAP. VIII.

On the Examination of Witnesses.

After considering, in the last chapter, what kind of evidence ought to be produced for ascertaining the points in issue, the next subject of inquiry relates to the manner in which witnesses are to be examined.

The ordinary mode of proceeding in the courts of common law, preparatory to the examination of a witness, is

to swear him in chief, unless an objection should be made to his competency; in which case, the practice formerly was to examine him on the voire dire, and this was so strictly observed, that if a witness were once examined in chief, he could not afterwards be objected to on the ground of interest. But, in later times, the rule has been to a certain extent relaxed, and now, if it should be discovered in any stage of the trial, that a witness is interested, his evidence will be rejected (*a*). This is as well for the convenience of the court, as for the purposes of justice. The examination of a witness, to discover whether he has any interest in the cause, is frequently to the same effect as his examination in chief; it therefore saves time and is more convenient, that the witness should be sworn in chief in the first instance; and if it should afterwards appear that he is
* 205 interested, it *will then be time to take the objection (1). This relaxation, however, of the ancient rule, does not extend so far as to allow the counsel on the cross-examination to ask the witness every sort of question, which might be proper on the voire dire. For example, after an examination in chief, a witness is not to be cross-examined as to the contents of a will not produced in court, under which it is suggested that he takes some interest, although such questions might be properly asked in an examination on the voire dire (2).

When the witness has been regularly sworn, he is first examined by the party which produces him; after which the other party is at liberty to cross-examine. The examination is in open court, in the presence of the parties, their attorneys and counsel, and before the judge and jury, who have thus an opportunity of observing the understanding, demeanour, and inclination of the witnesses (*b*).

(1) Turner v. Pearte, 1 T. R. 717. (2) Howell v. Lock, 2 Campb. 14. Perigal v. Nicholson, 1 Wightw. 64.

(*a*) Vide ante, 96. n. (c).

(*b*) Where the testimony of a Swede, wholly ignorant of the English language, to the grand jury was needed, the Court ordered

Leading questions, that is, such as instruct a witness how to answer on material points, are not allowed on the examination in chief; for, to direct witnesses in their evidence would only serve to strengthen that bias, which they are generally too much disposed to feel, in favour of the party that calls them (*c*). But, if a witness should appear to be in the interest of the opposite party, or unwilling to give evidence, the court will in its discretion allow the examination in chief to assume the form of a cross-examination. And, in examining a witness for the purpose of directly contradicting another witness, on the opposite side, as to some particular parts of his evidence, which no general examination in chief would be able to touch, leading questions may be properly asked. Thus, for example, after exhausting the witness's memory as to the contents of a written instrument, he may be asked whether it contained a particular *passage, which has been sworn to on the other side; otherwise it would be scarcely possible ever to come to a direct contradiction (1). * 206

A witness cannot be compelled to answer any question which has a tendency to expose him to penalties, or to a criminal charge (2) (*a*). Thus, on an indictment for a

(1) Courteen v. Touse, 1 Campb. 43.
(2) R. v. Ld. G. Gordon, 2 Doug. 593. Title v. Grevet, 2 Ld. Raym. 1088. 16 Ves. jun. 242. Preamb. St. 46 G. 3. c. 37.

---

an interpreter to be first sworn, truly to interpret between the court and jury and the witness. The oath was then administered to the witness in English, and interpreted to him by the sworn interpreter, as it was pronounced by the clerk. *Norberg's case*, 4 *Mass. Rep.* 81.

(*c*) Vide *Snyder's Lessee* v. *Snyder*, 6 *Binney* 483. But the question must be objected to at the time; therefore, if in taking the deposition of a witness a leading question be put and answered, it cannot afterwards be excepted to at the trial. *Sheeler* v. *Speer*, 3 *Binney* 130.

(*a*) A witness may object to answer a question which he thinks will tend to his crimination, though the answer would not lead to an immediate conclusion of guilt. *Cates* v. *Hardacre*, 3 *Taunt.* 424.

rape, the woman is not obliged to answer, whether on some former occasion she had not a criminal connexion with other men or with particular individuals (3); nor is evidence of such criminal intercourse admissible (4). So, on an appeal against an order of bastardy, a person cannot be compelled to acknowledge himself the father of a bastard child; but there is no objection to his being sworn, and if he chooses, he may confess the fact (5). So, it has been held, in an action for a libel (6), (which was published by the defendant in a voluntary affidavit sworn extrajudicially before a magistrate), that the magistrate's clerk is not bound to answer, whether he wrote the affidavit and delivered it to the magistrate, because the bare copying out of a libel is criminal (*b*).

(3) Hodgson's case, by a majority of the Judges on a case reserved, 1812, MS. Dodd v. Norris, 3 Campb. 519.

(4) By the opinion of all the Judges in Hodgson's case, MS.

(5) R. v. St. Mary's, Nottingham, 13 East 58. n.

(6) Maloney v. Bartley, before Wood, B. 3 Campb. 210. A bill of exceptions was tendered, but afterwards dropped.

(*b*) In an action of debt to recover the penalty given by the act of Congress of May 10, 1800, for transporting slaves from one foreign port or place to another, a *particeps criminis*, after the expiration of two years from the commission of the offence, without any prosecution commenced against him was compelled to testify against the defendant, although it was objected that he had fled from justice, and consequently was excluded from the benefit of the statute of limitations, act of April 30, 1790, sect. 32. Edwards, J. says, "It appears to me that the witness is *prima facie* protected from prosecution by the statute of limitations. The answer comes from him. He says he is not protected, because he has fled from justice. But he ought not to make his fleeing from justice, (his own crime,) a ground for withholding his testimony. At the same time the court will take care that the witness be not entrapped. The attorney will not be allowed to say now that the prosecution is barred and thus obtain his testimony; and afterwards bring forward a prosecution, and say that he is not barred because the witness has fled from justice." *The United States* v. *Smith*, 4 *Day* 123. On the trial of *Burr* for high treason, Marshall, Ch. J. held that it

Further, there are some authorities in support of the position, that a witness is not compellable to declare his own infamy, nor to confess what has a direct tendency to degrade his character (7). In Cooke's case, reported in the State Trials, where a question arose, whether a jury-man, who had been challenged, might be examined as to his having asserted the guilt of the prisoner before the trial, C. J. Treby *said, "You may ask upon the voire * 207
dire, whether he has any interest in the cause, nor shall we deny you liberty to ask, whether he is qualified according to law, by having a freehold of sufficient value: but that you may ask a juror (1) *or witness* every question that

(7) Vid. dictum by Treby, C. J. in Cooke's case, 4 St. Tr. 748., and by Pratt, C. J. Layer's case, 6 St. Tr. 259. R. v. Lewis, 4 Esp. N. P. C. 225. Macbride v. Macbride, do. 242.—In R. v. Edwards, 4 T. R. 440., on an application to bail the prisoner, the Court allowed the counsel to ask one of the bail, whether he had stood in the pillory for perjury.

(1) See also Co. Lit. 158. b.

---

was the province of the court to judge, whether any *direct* answer to the question which may be proposed, will furnish evidence against the witness. If such answer *may* disclose a fact, which forms a necessary and essential link in the chain of testimony, which would be sufficient to convict him of any crime, he is not bound to answer it, so as to furnish matter for that conviction. In such case the witness must himself judge what his answer will be; and if he says on oath, that he cannot answer without accusing himself, he cannot be compelled to answer. *The United States* v. *Burr*, cited 2 *Esp. Dig. New-York Ed.* 405.

A bill in chancery may be filed for a discovery, against a person charged with usury, but on the discovery and re-payment or return of the money, goods or other things so to be discovered, the defendant is acquitted from further forfeiture or penalty. *Laws of New-York*, sess. 10. c. 13. s. 4. 1 R. L. 66. By the *act to prevent duelling*, which makes the giving or accepting a challenge, or the fighting a duel, although no death ensue, a high misdemeanour in both principal and seconds, it is declared, that any person offending against the act shall be a competent witness against any other offender, and may be compelled to appear and give evidence, but shall not thereby be criminated himself. *Laws of New-York*, sess. 36. c. 45. s. 4. 2 R. L. 192.

rape, the woman is not obliged to answer, whether on some former occasion she had not a criminal connexion with other men or with particular individuals (3); nor is evidence of such criminal intercourse admissible (4). So, on an appeal against an order of bastardy, a person cannot be compelled to acknowledge himself the father of a bastard child; but there is no objection to his being sworn, and if he chooses, he may confess the fact (5). So, it has been held, in an action for a libel (6), (which was published by the defendant in a voluntary affidavit sworn extrajudicially before a magistrate), that the magistrate's clerk is not bound to answer, whether he wrote the affidavit and delivered it to the magistrate, because the bare copying out of a libel is criminal (*b*).

(3) Hodgson's case, by a majority of the Judges on a case reserved, 1812, MS. Dodd v. Norris, 3 Campb. 519.

(4) By the opinion of all the Judges in Hodgson's case, MS.

(5) R. v. St. Mary's, Nottingham, 13 East 58. n.

(6) Maloney v. Bartley, before Wood, B. 3 Campb. 210. A bill of exceptions was tendered, but afterwards dropped.

(*b*) In an action of debt to recover the penalty given by the act of Congress of May 10, 1800, for transporting slaves from one foreign port or place to another, a *particeps criminis*, after the expiration of two years from the commission of the offence, without any prosecution commenced against him was compelled to testify against the defendant, although it was objected that he had fled from justice, and consequently was excluded from the benefit of the statute of limitations, act of April 30, 1790, sect. 32. Edwards, J. says, "It appears to me that the witness is *prima facie* protected from prosecution by the statute of limitations. The answer comes from him. He says he is not protected, because he has fled from justice. But he ought not to make his fleeing from justice, (his own crime,) a ground for withholding his testimony. At the same time the court will take care that the witness be not entrapped. The attorney will not be allowed to say now that the prosecution is barred and thus obtain his testimony; and afterwards bring forward a prosecution, and say that he is not barred because the witness has fled from justice." *The United States* v. *Smith*, 4 *Day* 123. On the trial of *Burr* for high treason, Marshall, Ch. J. held that it

Further, there are some authorities in support of the position, that a witness is not compellable to declare his own infamy, nor to confess what has a direct tendency to degrade his character (7). In Cooke's case, reported in the State Trials, where a question arose, whether a jury-man, who had been challenged, might be examined as to his having asserted the guilt of the prisoner before the trial, C. J. Treby *said, "You may ask upon the voire dire, whether he has any interest in the cause, nor shall we deny you liberty to ask, whether he is qualified according to law, by having a freehold of sufficient value: but that you may ask a juror (1) *or witness* every question that

* 207

(7) Vid. dictum by Treby, C. J. in Cooke's case, 4 St. Tr. 748., and by Pratt, C. J. Layer's case, 6 St. Tr. 259. R. v. Lewis, 4 Esp. N. P. C. 225. Macbride v. Macbride, do. 242.—In R. v. Edwards, 4 T. R. 440., on an application to bail the prisoner, the Court allowed the counsel to ask one of the bail, whether he had stood in the pillory for perjury.

(1) See also Co. Lit. 158. b.

---

was the province of the court to judge, whether any *direct* answer to the question which may be proposed, will furnish evidence against the witness. If such answer *may* disclose a fact, which forms a necessary and essential link in the chain of testimony, which would be sufficient to convict him of any crime, he is not bound to answer it, so as to furnish matter for that conviction. In such case the witness must himself judge what his answer will be; and if he says on oath, that he cannot answer without accusing himself, he cannot be compelled to answer. *The United States* v. *Burr*, cited 2 *Esp. Dig. New-York Ed.* 405.

A bill in chancery may be filed for a discovery, against a person charged with usury, but on the discovery and re-payment or return of the money, goods or other things so to be discovered, the defendant is acquitted from further forfeiture or penalty. *Laws of New-York*, sess. 10. c. 13. s. 4. 1 R. L. 66. By the *act to prevent duelling*, which makes the giving or accepting a challenge, or the fighting a duel, although no death ensue, a high misdemeanour in both principal and seconds, it is declared, that any person offending against the act shall be a competent witness against any other offender, and may be compelled to appear and give evidence, but shall not thereby be criminated himself. *Laws of New-York*, sess. 36. c. 45. s. 4. 2 R. L. 192.

will not make him criminous, that is too large. *Men have been asked whether they have been convicted and pardoned for felony, or whether they have been whipped for petty larceny, but they have not been obliged to answer;* for although their answer in the affirmative will not make them criminal, nor subject them to punishment, yet they are matters of infamy, and, *if it be an infamous thing, that is enough to preserve a man from being bound to answer.* A pardoned man is not guilty; his crime is purged. But merely for the reproach of it, *it shall not be put upon him to answer a question, whereon he will be forced to forswear or disgrace himself.* So, *persons have been excused from answering, whether they have been committed to bridewell,* as pilferers or vagrants, &c. yet to be suspected is only a misfortune and shame, no crime. The like has been observed in other cases of odious and infamous matters, which are not crimes indictable (2) (*a*)."

(2) Cooke's case, 4 St. Tr. 748.

(*a*) On an indictment for larceny at the General Sessions of the Peace, one Hardy, on being produced as evidence for the defendant was interrogated by the public prosecutor, "Whether he had not been convicted of petit larceny, and whether he was not then in confinement under that conviction?" The counsel for the prisoner objected to the question, insisting that the witness was not bound to answer it; but the court overruled the objection, and the witness answering the question in the affirmative, he was set aside as incompetent, and the prisoner was convicted. The case being referred to the Supreme Court, by the court below, for their advice, it was held that the proceedings were erroneous. Spencer, J. in delivering the opinion of the court, observes; "It may be said that a witness may be introduced unexpectedly, and that a party may be surprised so far, as not to have the record of conviction ready to produce. This is very probable; but other things are to be considered than the convenience or interest of parties. It is against a fundamental principle, that a party shall accuse himself and propagate to the remotest period, his own infamy. The declaration of the party is not the best evidence of which the case is sus-

In Layer's case (3), on an indictment for high treason, the prisoner insisted that a witness should be examined on the *voire dire*, whether he had a promise of pardon, or some other reward, for swearing against him; the point was argued by his counsel, and overruled by the court. The Lord Ch. J. Pratt said, "You see, the most you can make of it is, that it is an objection to his credit; and if it goes to his credit, must he not be sworn, and his credit left to the jury? He must be examined as a legal witness. But *if this man, under expectation or promise of a pardon, comes here to swear that which is not true, and you would ask him to that, he is not obliged to answer it. No body is to discredit himself*, but always to be taken to be innocent, till it appear *otherwise. If *they, who ask the question, insinuate any thing like that*, (namely, that the witness can give no evidence except what is false), *it ought not to have an answer:* but if he has a promise of pardon, if he gives * 208

(3) 6 St. Tr. 259.

---

ceptible; and it may be the fact, that the party himself mistakes the nature of his offence; for we perceive that *conspiracy* and even *barratry*, will exclude a person from testifying; the infamy of the crime, and not the nature of the punishment, working the incapacity. But the hardship of excluding such questions is imaginary. If the witness has been convicted of an infamous crime, his character is lost; and it is not to be supposed there are not witnesses, within the reach of the party, to prove the character of the witness. If the offence has been committed long before, and the witness by his good conduct, has regained his standing in society, then it affords no regret that the party objecting to his competency has not the record of his conviction. On authority and the fitness of the rule, we are of opinion, that the proceedings in the court below are erroneous, on the ground that the witness, *Hardy*, was excluded from testifying." *The People* v. *Herrick*. 13 *Johns. Rep.* 82. "It is laid down as an axiom, by almost all the writers on evidence, that the party who would take advantage of the exception, that a witness has been convicted of the *crimen falsi*, must have a copy of the record of conviction ready to produce in court." *Ibid.*

true evidence, it is no objection to his being a witness, or to his credit." And Mr. Justice Fortescue Aland, referring to a case cited, where a similar point was made and overruled, said, "The reason the court gave, (that it was improper to ask this question in the *voire dire*), was, that if he had this promise, such promise was made either to speak the truth, or to speak a falsehood; *if it were to give just and true evidence, there was no harm in it; and if it was a promise of pardon for speaking what was not true, the witness was not bound to answer that question.*" It has been before mentioned, that if a witness is asked, whether he has been convicted of an offence, and admits the fact, yet the mere admission will not make him incompetent; notwithstanding that he might be incompetent, if the conviction were legally proved by an examined copy of the record (1).

It has been doubted whether a witness could be compelled to give any evidence which might subject him to a civil action or charge him with a debt (*a*). But now, "It is declared by stat. 46 G. 3. c. 37. that a witness cannot by law refuse to answer a question relevant to the matter in issue, (the answering of which has no tendency to accuse himself, or to expose him to penalty or forfeiture of any nature whatsoever), on the ground, that the answering of such question may establish, or tend to establish, that he owes a debt, or is otherwise subject to a civil suit." But the right, which the *parties to a suit* have, to refuse answering any question, is not in any degree affected by this statute; and, therefore, on a question of settlement, a rated parishioner is not compellable by the adverse parish to

(1) See R. v. Teale, R. v. Carcinion, supra, p. 24.

(*a*) See the opinions of the twelve judges of England on a question referred to them by the House of Lords. Eight of the judges and the Lord Chancellor held that the witness was bound to answer a question, although his answer might render him liable to a civil action; the other four judges expressed a contrary opinion. See *The opinions of the twelve judges* in 1 *Hall's Law Journal* 223.

give evidence, as he is directly interested as party to the *appeal, and does not come within the words or meaning of the act (1). * 209

A witness can depose only to such facts as are within his own recollection. But to assist his memory he may use a written entry, or memorandum, or the copy of a memorandum; and, if afterwards he can positively swear to the truth of the fact there stated, such evidence will be sufficient (*a*). But, if he cannot from recollection speak to the fact any further, than as finding it stated in a written entry, his testimony will amount to nothing (2). When a witness has recourse to a written memorandum for the purpose of assisting his recollection, there seems to be no good reason for confining him to such writings only as were drawn up at the precise time when the facts occurred; for one person may have as clear and strong a recollection, from looking at a paper written half a year after the fact, as another who wrote down the fact on the very day it happened. However, the entry ought to have been made by the witness himself, or, if made by another, examined by him, while the fact was fresh in his memory (3).

In general, the opinion of a witness is not evidence: he must speak to facts. But on questions of science or trade, or others of the same kind, persons of skill may speak not only as to facts, but are allowed also to give their opinions in evidence. Evidence of character is founded on opinion, and the opinion of a medical man is evidence as to the state of a patient (*b*). So, ship-builders have been admitted to

(1) R. v. Inhabitants of Woburn, 10 East 395.

(2) Sandwell v. Sandwell, per Holt, C. J. Comberb. 445. Doe v. Perkins, 3 T. R. 752. Tanner v. Taylor, ib. 754. 8 East 284. 289.

(3) Burrough v. Martin, 2 Campb. 112.

(*a*) Papers may be shown to a witness on his examination, to refresh his memory, and enable him to correct any mistake which he may have previously made in giving his testimony. *Steinback* v. *Columbian Insurance Company*, 2 *Caines' Rep.* 131.

(*b*) On trials for murder, by poisoning, the evidence of medical men is frequently required to determine, whether the deceased

state their opinion on the sea-worthiness of a ship, from a survey, which had been taken by others, and at which they were not present (4). So, in an action of trespass for
* 210 making an embankment, which was said to have *gradually choaked up Wells harbour, an engineer was permitted to prove from his own experiments, what were the effects of natural causes upon that particular harbour, and on other harbours similarly situated on the same coast, and that the removal of the bank would not, in his opinion, restore the harbour (1). So, where the question is, whether a seal has been forged, seal engravers may be called to show a difference between a genuine impression and that supposed to be false (2).

In cross-examinations, the object of which is to sift evidence, and try the credibility of the witnesses, a great latitude is allowed in the mode of putting questions. The rule, however, is still subject to certain limitations. A witness cannot be cross-examined as to any fact, which (if admitted) would be collateral, and wholly irrelevant to the matter in issue, for the purpose of contradicting him by other evidence, (in case he should deny the fact), and in this manner to discredit his testimony (3); and if the witness answers such an irrelevant question before it is disallowed or withdrawn, evidence cannot afterwards be admitted to contradict his testimony on the collateral matter (4). In the application of this rule, the principal thing to be considered will be, whether the question is *irrelevant*

(4) Thornton v. Royal Exch. Ass. Company, Peake N. P. C. 25. Chaurand v. Angerstein, ib. 43.

(1) Folkes v. Chad, 1783, MS. cited by Buller, J. in Goodtitle v. Braham, 4 T. R. 498.

(2) Per Ld. Mansfield in Folkes v. Chad, ib.

(3) Spenceley v. De Willot, 7 East 108.

(4) Harris v. Tippet, 2 Campb. 638.

---

came to his death by poison. This subject is discussed in 1 *M'Nally* 329—335. Where the opinions of physicians are given in evidence, the facts on which they ground their opinions must be stated. *Dickinson* v. *Barber*, 9 *Mass. Rep.* 225. *Hathorn & others* v. *King*, 8 *Mass. Rep.* 371.

to the points in issue between the parties. In an action for usury, it would be entirely immaterial and irrelevant to cross-examine the witness respecting *other* contracts supposed to have been made by the defendant, unless the witness had first said that the contracts were the same; and that was the point in the case of Spencely v. De Willot. So, it would be irrelevant to ask a witness in cross-examination, whether he had not attempted to dissuade another witness from attending the trial (5). But it is not irrelevant on the trial of a prisoner, to cross-examine *the witness to this point, whether, in consequence of being charged with robbing the prisoner, he had not said that he would be *revenged* upon him, &c.; and if the witness should deny having used such a threat, evidence may be given to contradict him (1). * 211

When a witness has been once sworn to give evidence, the other party may cross-examine him, though he gave no evidence for the party that called him (2). And it is reported to have been ruled at nisi prius, that if a witness has been once examined by a party, the privilege of cross-examination continues in every stage of the cause; so, that the other party may call the same witness to prove his case, and in examining him may ask leading questions (3). In the case referred to, the witness might possibly have shown a strong bias in favour of the first party that called him, and on this account perhaps a greater scope was granted to the adverse party than is usually allowed. It may happen, on the other hand, that the plaintiff calls a witness, unwillingly and from mere necessity, knowing him to be favourable to the other side: in such a case, to allow the defendant, on calling him up afterwards as his own witness, to put leading questions, would be giving him an unreasonable advantage; on the contrary, the court might perhaps be induced to invest the plaintiff's counsel with

(5) Harris v. Tippet, 2 Campb. 637.

(1) Yewin's case, 2 Campb. 638. n. before Lawrence, J.

(2) Philips v. Eamer, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 357.

(3) Dickinson v. Shee, 4 Esp. N. P. C. 67.

some of the powers of cross-examination, at the same time that it would probably oblige the defendant's counsel to treat such a witness strictly as his own, and confine him within the limits of an examination in chief (*a*). If one party calls for the other party's books, but, when they are produced, declines using them, the mere calling for them will not make them evidence for the adverse party (4) (*b*).

(4) Sayer v. Kitchen, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 210.

(*a*) It has been decided that when a party cross-examines a witness, he makes him as much his own, as if he himself had called him, and that therefore he could not introduce through him any proof which would not have been legal, had the witness been originally produced on his behalf; for instance, he cannot give parol proof, by the witness, of the contents of a writing, without showing notice to produce it. *Jackson d. Van Slyck & others* v. *Son*, 2 *Caines' Rep.* 178.

The examination of witnesses, says Tilghman, C. J. is to be conducted in such a manner as to discover the truth without taking any unfair advantage. The party who calls the witness examines him first, he is then cross-examined by the opposite party, after which, if necessary, the party who produced him may examine him again. The mouth of the witness is not to be closed because the counsel omitted to ask a material question at first. It may be necessary, in order to come at the truth of the case, to examine him as to new matter, and after that, there may be a second cross-examination. The court, at their discretion, may permit a witness to be examined by either party, over and over again, at any time during the trial. But they will take care to exercise this discretion, so as not to suffer any advantage to be gained by trick or artifice. If the plaintiff should declare that he had finished his testimony, in consequence of which the defendant should dismiss some of his witnesses, and then the plaintiff should offer to produce new testimony, which might perhaps have been contradicted by the witnesses who had been dismissed, the court would not suffer him to avail himself of such disingenuous conduct. *Curren* v. *Connery*, 5 *Binney* 488. Vide *Richardson* v. *Lessee of Stewart*, 4 *Binney* 198.

(*b*) Vide *Lawrence & Whitney* v. *Van Horne & Clarkson*, 1 *Caines' Rep.* 276. *Kenny* v. *Clarkson & Van Horne*, 1 *Johns. Rep.* 385.

It may, said Lord Kenyon, be matter of observation to the counsel on the other side, that the entries in the books *were in favour of his client, but cannot entitle him to offer the books in evidence to the jury. If, however, the party who has called for the books, inspects them, he thereby makes them evidence for the other party, although he has not used them himself in evidence (1). Where books are refused, it is a suspicious circumstance, and open to much observation, but it will not be *conclusive* against the party. * 212

There are several ways of impeaching the credit of a witness. 1. The party, against whom a witness is called, may disprove the facts stated by him, or may examine other witnesses, as to his general character: but they will not be allowed to speak to particular facts or parts of his conduct (2); for, "though every man is supposed to be capable of supporting the one, it is not likely that he should be prepared to answer the other without notice;" and, even if he should happen to be prepared to defend himself, such evidence would generally afford a very slight and imperfect test of his credibility. The regular mode is, to inquire whether they have the means of knowing the former witness's general character, and whether from such knowledge, they would believe him on his oath (3). In answer to such evidence against character, the other party may cross-examine the witnesses as to their means of knowledge; or may attack their general character, and by fresh evidence support the character of his own witness. 2. The credit of a witness may be impeached, by proof that he has made statements out of court (*a*), on the same subject, contrary to what he swears at the trial (4). A let-

(1) Wharam v. Routlege, 5 Esp. N. P. C. 235.
(2) Bull. N. P. 296.
(3) Per Holt, C. J. in Rockwood's case, 4 St. Tr. 693. Mawson v. Hartsink, 4 Esp. N. P. C. 102.
(4) De Sailly v. Morgan, 2 Esp. N. P. C. 691.

(*a*) Vide *State* v. *Norris*, 1 *Hayw.* 438.

ter, therefore, written by him (*b*), or a deposition signed by him, may be used as evidence to contradict his testimony; but a conviction before a magistrate, purporting to set
* 213 out the *deposition of a witness, is not evidence for this purpose (1) (*a*). In answer to such evidence, and for the purpose of corroborating the testimony of the witness, the Ch. B. Gilbert is of opinion that the party who called him, may show that he affirmed the same thing before on other occasions, and that he is still consistent with himself (2) (*b*).

If an attesting witness to a will or deed impeach its validity on the ground of fraud, and accuse other subscribing witnesses, who are dead, of being accomplices in the fraud, the party claiming under the instrument may give evidence of their general good character. For, if living, they might be produced as witnesses, and their character would then appear in cross-examination; and after their death an opportunity ought to be given, to show what credit is to be

(1) R. v. Howe, 6 Esp. N. P. C. 125. 1 Campb. 461. S. C.

(2) Gilb. Ev. 135. See Lutterel v. Reynell, 1 Mod. 282., where this confirmatory evidence was offered *in chief*, which would not now be allowed; and it is doubted in Buller's N. P., p. 294., whether it is good evidence in *reply*.

(*b*) Vide *Baker & Rowlson* v. *Arnold*, 3 *Caines' Rep.* 279. It is for the jury to determine which is entitled to most credit, the witness on his oath, or the testimony adduced to contradict him. *Ibid.* The evidence stated in a case made on a former trial cannot be admitted to impeach the testimony of the same witness given on a second trial of the same cause. *Neilson & others* v. *Columbian Insurance Company*, 1 *Johns. Rep.* 301.

(*a*) It has been held that the credit of a witness may be impeached, by showing at the time the facts sworn to took place, he was intoxicated. *Tuttle* v. *Russel*, 2 *Day* 201.

(*b*) A deed from a defendant in ejectment to a third person subsequent to the commencement of the suit, may be read in evidence upon the trial of the ejectment, in order to support the credit of a witness, who had sworn that he had no interest in the land, and whose credit had been impeached. *Richardson* v. *Stewart's Lessee*, 4 *Binney* 198.

attached to their attestation (3). But in a case, where a witness for the plaintiff asserts one thing, and a witness for the defendant asserts another, and direct fraud is not imputed to either, evidence to general character is not admissible (4).

A party will not be permitted to produce general evidence to discredit his own witness. "This," says Mr. J. Buller, "would enable him to destroy the witness if he spoke against him, and to make him a good witness if he spoke for him, with the means in his hand of destroying his credit if he spoke against him (5)." The meaning of this rule is, that a party cannot prove his own witness to be of such a general bad character, as would make him unworthy of credit (*c*). If he knew the infamy of his character, he was practising a fraud upon the court in producing him as a witness. But if a witness unexpectedly give *evidence against the party that called him, another witness may be called to prove those facts otherwise; as, where the question was, whether the defendant's servant, who had been employed to sell a horse, had warranted him sound, he swore, on being called by the plaintiff, that he had not given any warranty; and Lord Ellenborough allowed the plaintiff to call another witness to prove, that at the time of the sale he had expressly warranted its soundness. There can be no rule of law, by which the truth on such an occasion is to be shut out, and justice perverted (1). * 214

(3) Doe dem. Walker v. Stephenson, 3 Esp. N. P. C. 284., 4 Esp. N. P. C. 50; cited and approved in 1 Campb. 210.

(4) Bp. of Durham v. Beaumont, 1 Campb. 207.

(5) Bull. N. P. 297.

(1) Alexander v. Gibson, 2 Campb. 556. Bull. N. P. 297.

(*c*) So, the party first calling a witness cannot object to his testimony, that he was interested. *Den d. Farrar* v. *Hamilton, Tayl.* 14.

CHAP. IX.

On Bills of Exceptions, and Demurrers to Evidence.

THE competency of witnesses and the admissibility of evidence are to be decided by the judge who tries the cause, and from his judgment there is an appeal, by a bill of exceptions.

Bill of exceptions.

At common law, a writ of error could not be brought for any error in law, which did not appear on the record; and therefore where the plaintiff or defendant alleged any thing ore tenus, which was overruled by the judge, the party aggrieved had no redress (2). To remedy this defect, it was enacted by stat. 13 Ed. 1. s. 31. "if one, impleaded before any of the justices, allege an exception, praying that the justices will allow it, that, if they will not, and if he write the exception and require the justices to put their seals to it, the justices shall do so, and if one will not, another shall (*a*)."

(2) 2 Inst. 426.

(*a*) The New-York statute is in almost the same words. Sess. 16. c. 4. s. 6. 1 R. L. 326. In Virginia it is required that the bill of exceptions should be signed by the greater part of the justices present. 3 *Hen. & Mun.* 224.

A bill of exceptions ought to be upon some point of law, either in admitting or denying of evidence, or a challenge, or some matter of law arising upon a fact not denied, in which either party is overruled by the court; if such bill be tendered and the exceptions in it are truly stated, then the justices ought to set their seal, in testimony that such exceptions were taken at the trial; but if the bill contain matters false, or untruely stated, or matters wherein they were not overruled, they are not obliged to affix the seal. A bill of exceptions is not to draw the whole matter in examination again, it is only for a single point, and the truth of it can never be doubted after the bill is sealed, for the adverse party is concluded

This statute extends to the plaintiff as well as the defendant (3), and to a trial at bar as well as at nisi prius (4). *But it has been doubted, whether it extends to criminal cases. Lord Coke, in his exposition of the statute, states that it extends to all actions, real, personal, and mixed; but of criminal cases he makes no mention. In the case of Sir H. Vane (1), who was tried for high treason, the court refused to sign a bill of exceptions, "because," they said, "criminal cases were not within the statute, but only actions between party and party." From this authority Mr. Sergt. Hawkins infers only, that a bill of exceptions is not allowable on an indictment for treason or felony (2). "Whether a bill lies not in any criminal case," said Lord

*215

(3) 2 Inst. 427.

(4) Thurston v. Statford, 3 Salk. 155; Adm. per Cur. in Duchess of Grafton v. Holt, Skin. 354. R. v. Smith, 2 Show. 287., contra.

(1) 1 Lev. 63; Kel. 15. S. C.; 1 Sid. 85. S. C.

(2) Pl. Cr. b. 2. c. 46. s. 210.

---

from averring the contrary, or supplying an omission in it. *Bridgman & Holt, Show. Par. Ca.* 120. *Bac. Abr. Bill of Exceptions. Graham* v. *Cammann*, 2 *Caines' Rep.* 168. 5 *Johns. Rep.* 467. 8 *Johns. Rep.* 507. All discussions must be confined to, and no notice can be taken of, matter not appearing on the face of the bill of exceptions. 8 *East* 280. 2 *Dall.* 38. 422. *n.* 2 *Binney* 168. A bill of exceptions will lie to the opinion of the judge in his charge to the jury. *Smith* v. *Carrington*, 4 *Cranch* 63. The exception must be insisted on at the trial, and is waived by delay; the statute indeed appoints no time, but the nature and reason of the thing requires the exception should be reduced to writing when taken and disallowed; not that it need be drawn up in form; but the substance must be reduced to writing while the thing is transacting, because it is to become a record. *Wright* v. *Sharp*, 1 *Salk.* 288. *Sikes* v. *Ransom*, 6 *Johns. Rep.* 279. *Gardner* v. *Baillie*, 1 *Bos. & Pul.* 32. A bill of exceptions tendered after the jury have returned into court with their verdict, but before it is delivered, is in season to any exception to the charge of the judge, but not as to any question of evidence arising at the trial. *Lanuse* v. *Barker*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 312. *Jones* v. *Insurance Company of North America*, 4 *Dall.* 249. S. C. 1 *Binney* 38.

Hardwicke, "is a point not settled (3)." It was allowed in the case of the King against Lord Paget and others, on an indictment for a trespass (4), and also on an information in the nature of a quo warranto (5). But Lord Hardwicke, in the case before referred to, after saying "that he had known a bill of exceptions allowed in informations in the Court of Exchequer, which are civil suits for the king's debt," added, "it has never been determined to lie in mere criminal proceedings in other courts (6)." A bill of exceptions cannot be allowed by the justices of the peace at the Quarter Sessions on the hearing of an appeal against an order of removal (7) (*a*). It can be used only on a writ of error, and therefore where a writ of error will not lie, there cannot be a bill of exceptions (8) (*b*).

Demurrer to evidence.

A demurrer to evidence is a proceeding, by which the judges, whose province it is to determine questions of law, are called upon to declare what the law is upon the facts in evidence. And it is analogous to the demurrer upon facts alleged in pleading (9).

* 216

*When the admissibility of the evidence has been established. the question, how far it conduces to the proof of the fact, which is to be ascertained, is not for the judge to de-

(3) R. v. Inhabitants of Preston, Rep. temp. Hard. 251.
(4) 1 Leon. 5.
(5) R. v. Higgins and others, 1 Ventr. 366.
(6) Rep. temp. Hard. 251.
(7) See (3).
(8) Bull. N. P. 316.
(9) See the judgment of Eyre, C. J. in Gibson and Johnson v. Hunter, 2 H. Bl. 205, 206.

(*a*) In all cases of appeals to the sessions from an order of justices, no bill of exceptions lies. *Sweet* v. *Overseers of Clinton*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 23.

(*b*) By a statute of the state of New-York, sess. 36. c. 3. s. 4. 1 R. L. 319., a bill of exceptions upon issues in the Supreme Court is to be returned at the next term by the justice, who puts his seal thereto as a witness, and the Supreme Court shall give judgment to allow or disallow the exception, and may grant a new trial in their discretion, and the bill of exceptions and judgment thereon being made matter of record, a writ of error may be brought.

cide, but for the jury exclusively. And when the jury have ascertained the fact, if a question arises, whether the fact thus ascertained maintains the issue joined between the parties, or, in other words, whether the law arising upon the fact is in favour of one or other of the parties, that question is for the judge to decide (1). Ordinarily, he declares to the jury what the law is upon the fact which they find, and then they compound their verdict of the law and fact. But if the party wishes to withdraw from the jury the application of the law to the fact, and all consideration of what the law is upon the fact, he then demurs in law upon the evidence (2).

It is reasonable that either party should have such a power of referring to the court to decide what the inference of law is upon the facts; as the jury may refuse to find a special verdict, in which case the facts would not appear on the record. On the other hand, as it is the peculiar province of the jury, to ascertain the truth of facts and the credibility of witnesses, the party ought not to be allowed, by a demurrer to evidence, or any other means, to refer the trial of such questions to another tribunal. A demurrer must therefore admit the truth of all facts, which the jury might find in favour of the other party, upon the evidence laid before them, whatever the nature of that evidence may be, whether of record, or in writing (3), or by parol (4) (*a*). According to Alleyn's report of the case of Wright v. Pindar, it was resolved, "that he that demurs upon the evidence ought to confess the whole matter of fact to be true, and not refer that to the judgment of the court; and if the matter of fact be uncertainly alleged, or that it be doubtful whether it be true or no, because offered to be *proved only by presumptions or probabilities, and the other party demurs thereupon, he that alleges this * 217

(1) 2 H. Bl. 205.
(2) Ib.
(3) Baker's case, 5 Co. Rep. 104.
(4) Wright v. Pindar, Alleyn 18.

(*a*) Vide *Hurst* v. *Dippo*, 1 *Dall.* 20.

matter cannot join in demurrer with him, but ought to pray the judgment of the court, that he may not be admitted to his demurrer, unless he will confess the matter of the fact to be true (*a*)." And now it is an established rule, that, in a demurrer to circumstantial evidence, the party offering the evidence is not obliged to join in demurrer, unless the party demurring will distinctly admit upon the record every fact and every conclusion, which the proposed evidence conduces to prove (1).

If, in an information, or any other suit, evidence be given for the king, and the defendant offers to demur upon it,

(1) Gibson and Johnson v. Hunter, 2 H. Bl. 137.

(*a*) Every inference, which the jury might fairly have drawn from the evidence, in favour of the party offering it, will on a demurrer to evidence be considered as admitted. *Cocksedge* v. *Fanshaw*, 1 *Doug.* 119. *Patrick* v. *Ludlow*, 3 *Johns. Cases* 10. *Forbes* v. *Church*, *Id.* 159. *Steinback* v. *Columbian Insurance Company*, 2 *Caines' Rep.* 134. *Smith* v. *Steinback*, 2 *Caines' Cases in Error* 158. *Lewis* v. *Few*, 5 *Johns. Rep.* 29. *Snowden* v. *Phœnix Insurance Company*, 3 *Binney* 457. *Stephens* v. *White*, 2 *Wash.* 203. In *Paulding & others* v. *The United States*, 4 *Cranch* 219., Marshall, Ch. J. states the doctrine on this point in these words:—"The party demurring admits the truth of the testimony to which he demurs, and also those conclusions of fact which a jury may fairly draw from that testimony. Forced and violent inferences he does not admit; but the testimony is to be taken most strongly against him, and such conclusions as a jury might justifiably draw, the court ought to draw." In *Patrick* v. *Hallett & Bowne*, 1 *Johns. Rep.* 241., Livingston, J. says;—"If there were any evidence, now, from which a jury might have drawn this conclusion," (that the vessel was seaworthy) "it must be considered as admitted by the demurrer, and that too, without any scrupulous inquiry, whether such inference would be correct or not, for courts should not encourage this practice. It is not only productive of considerable delay and expense, but unless all inferences are admitted, which a jury might have drawn, judges, instead of confining themselves within their province of deciding on questions of law, will also become triers of every matter of fact."

the king's counsel cannot be compelled to join in demurrer, but in such case the Court ought to direct the jury to find the special matter; and, upon that, they shall adjudge the law (2).

When all matters of fact are admitted, the case is ripe for judgment in matter of law upon the evidence, and may then be properly withdrawn from the jury; and being entered on record, it will remain for the decision of the judges (3).

The whole proceeding upon a demurrer to evidence is under the control and direction of the judge at nisi prius, or of the Court on a trial at bar. The Court, said Mr. J. Doddridge in the case of Worsley v. Filisker (4), may deny and hinder a party from demurring, by overruling the matter in demurrer, if it seem to them to be clear in law. And in that case the Court did overrule the demurrer, and left the case to the jury (*b*).

(2) 5 Co. Rep. 104.
(3) 2 H. Bl. 208.
(4) 2 Roll. Rep. 119. Bull. N. P. 314.

(*b*) Vide *Wroe* v. *Washington & others*, 1 *Wash.* 357. *Harrison* v. *Brock*, 1 *Mun.* 22.

END OF PART I.

PART THE SECOND.

ON WRITTEN EVIDENCE.

THE preceding chapters having treated of the competency of witnesses, and of parol or unwritten evidence, it is now proposed to inquire into the several kinds of written evidence.

Writings are either public or private. Some public writings are of record; others not of record. And public writings not of record, may be distinguished into such as are of a judicial character, and such as are of a public nature, but not judicial. In this order it is proposed to treat of the several kinds of written evidence; and to consider, first, in what cases they are admissible; and, secondly, if admitted, how they ought to be proved.

CHAP. I.

Of Acts of Parliament.

Records. RECORDS are the memorials of the legislature, and of the King's courts of Justice (*a*); and they are considered of

(*a*) That the proceeding of a court may have the effect of a record, it must be enrolled: thus, where on an issue of nul tiel record, a judgment was produced, and to rebut that evidence the plaintiff produced a rule setting aside the judgment for irregularity, the court held that the writing on the minutes could not be received as evidence against the record. The Court say; "It appears to be contrary to all the well settled technical rules upon the subject to give the entry that effect. A record imports verity and can only be tried by itself. The vacatur ought to be enrolled or entered of

such authority, that no evidence is allowed to contradict them (1) (*b*). Thus, if a verdict, finding several issues, were to be produced in evidence, the opposite party would not be allowed to show that no evidence was offered on one of the issues, and that the finding of the jury was indorsed on the postea by mistake (2). So, where the declaration stated that a precept issued, directed to the *mayor* of a borough, *and, on producing the precept, it appeared to have been written, thus, "to the *mayor and commonalty*," but the two latter words had been struck through with a pen, the court refused to admit evidence, that those words had not been obliterated, when the precept was delivered and returned (1). An officer, who has the care and custody of records, may be examined as to their condition, though he cannot be examined as to their matter or contents (2). *219

A record, then, is conclusive proof, that the decision or judgment of the Court was, as is there stated: and evidence to contradict it will not be admitted. But it will not be conclusive as to the truth of allegations, which were not material nor traversable (3). Thus, for example, a party will not be estopped from averring, in an action of debt on a bond, that the bond was made at A., though in a

(1) Co. Lit. 117. b. 260. a. Gilb. Ev. 5. Bull. N. P. 221.
(2) Reed v. Jackson, 1 East 355.
(1) Dickson v. Fisher, 4 Burr. 2267; 1 Black. 664., S. C.
(2) Leighton v. Leighton, 1 Str. 210.
(3) Co. Lit. 352. b.

---

record, as much as the rule for judgment. The court could not receive the entry on the minutes of the rule for judgment, as evidence to support a plea of a former recovery, and why should an entry vacating a judgment be received to contradict the enrolment of the judgment? The maxim in this, as well as in other cases is, that nihil tam naturale quam quidlibet dissolvi eo modo quo ligatur. To give an entry on the minutes that authority, would destroy the certainty, order, and solemnity of enrolments; and it has been frequently held, that the courts cannot regard any proceeding as a matter of record until it is enrolled." *Croswell* v. *Byrnes*, 9 *Johns. Rep.* 287.

(*b*) Vide *Leech* v. *Armitage*, 2 *Dall.* 125.

former action upon the same bond, he averred it to have been made at B (4). So, in the case of a conviction for felony, &c., where the jury have given a general verdict, the record will not be conclusive, that the offence was committed on the day mentioned in the indictment, for the time is not of the substance of the charge; and, therefore, the party interested to dispute the forfeiture, (which, in the case of real property, relates to the time of the offence,) may falsify the record, and show that the offence was committed on another day (5). But if the jury find specially the precise day, all parties are concluded (6) (*a*).

The first sort of records, to be considered, are acts of parliament; and these, says Ch. B. Gilbert, are the highest and most absolute proof. Acts of parliament relate either to the kingdom at large, when they are called general acts; or only to particular classes of men, or to certain individuals, in which case they are called private acts. Laws which concern the king, or all lords of manors, or all
* 220 officers *in general, or all spiritual persons, or all traders, &c. are public laws. But such as relate to the nobility only, or to spiritual lords, or to particular officers or particular trades, are private acts (1). This distinction between public and private acts is not applied, in collections of the English statutes at large, to any statutes previous to those of Richard the third. From that period the distinction commences in the several tables prefixed to the respective collections (2).

(4) Com. Dig. tit. Estoppel, E. 6.
(5) Ives's case, 3 Inst. 230. Gilb. Ev. 230.
(6) Gilb. Ev. 230.
(1) Gilb. Ev. 39, 40.
(2) See preface to new edit. of Statutes at large.

(*a*) An entry on the record of the issuing of a writ, is not conclusive; it is a fact triable by the jury and not by the record. Such an entry, the court say, is like a committitur entered of record; it does not estop the party to deny the fact, and it shall be tried per pais, and the record is but evidence and not conclusive. *Brown* v. *Van Deuzer*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 51.

The general rule is, that public acts of parliament are to be taken notice of judicially by courts of law, without being formally set forth; but particular or private acts are not regarded by the judges, unless formally shown and pleaded (3). In some cases, however, the necessity of pleading a private act has been dispensed with; as, where there is a special clause, enabling the defendant, in answer to any action for matters done under the act, to plead the general issue; or, where the private act has been recognized by some public act of the legislature. Thus, the statute 23 H. 6. c. 9., relative to sheriffs' bonds, (even supposing it to be a private act, as relating only to officers of a certain description,) must now be taken notice of judicially, because the statute 4 & 5 Ann. c. 16. s. 20. enables the sheriff to assign the bond (4).

In many cases a defendant will be precluded, by the nature of the pleadings, from taking advantage of a public act of parliament. Thus, in an action of debt upon a bond, the defendant cannot, under the plea of non est factum, avail himself of the statute 13 Eliz. c. 8. s. 4. (5), which makes usurious contracts utterly void. But if he pleads that the bond was void on account of usury, he may insist upon the statute, though he has not formally recited it (6). In an *action of assumpsit, indeed, where the defendant may give in evidence any thing that discharges the debt, or proves nothing due, he may show under the general issue, that the contract was usurious (1), or founded on an illegal consideration which makes the contract void (2). * 221

If an action or information be brought upon a penal statute, and there is another statute which exempts or discharges the defendant from the penalty, this latter act (as some books lay down the rule) cannot be given in evidence under the general issue, but ought to be pleaded; for the

(3) Bull. N. P. 222.

(4) Saxby v. Kirkus, Bull. N. P. 224. Samuel v. Evans, 2 T. R. 575.

(5) See also 12 Ann. St. 2. c. 16.

(6) Com. Dig. tit. Pleader, 2 W. 23.

(1) Ld. Bernard v. Saul, 1 Str. 498. Bull. N. P. 152. S. C.

(2) Adm. per Cur. in Hussey v. Jacob, 1 Ld. Ray. 89.

general issue is but a denial of the plaintiff's declaration, and the plaintiff, it is said, has proved him guilty, when he has proved him within the law upon which he founds his declaration (3). It is, indeed, enacted by statute 21 Jac. 1. c. 4. s. 4. that, in actions on penal statutes, it shall be lawful for the defendant to plead not guilty, or that he owes nothing, and to give in evidence such special matter, which, if pleaded, would have discharged the defendant at law; but this statute has been generally considered to attach only on antecedent penal laws, and not to extend to those subsequently enacted (4). However, it should seem, according to the modern practice, the defendant may plead *nil debet*, and give in evidence the statute; which would show, that he does not owe the penalty. And if the same act, which imposes the penalty, contains also the proviso of exemption, it is quite clear that this proviso may be shown under the general issue (5).

(3) 2 Roll. Ab. 683. pl. 13. Bull. N. P. 225.

(4) Gaul's case, 1 Salk. 372. Hicks's case, ib. Per Lord Mansfield in 4 Burr. 2467. Bull. N. P. 196. French q. t. v. Coxon, 2 Str. 1081; more fully stated in 2 Selw. N. P. 562. n. (117.)

(5) 4 Burr. 2469. Bull. N. P. 225.

* CHAP. II.

On Verdicts, and Judgments of Courts of Record.

In treating of judicial proceedings, and inquiring in what cases they are admissible in evidence, it is proposed to consider, first, the verdicts and judgments of courts of record; secondly, the judgments of courts of exclusive jurisdiction; and, thirdly, certain other proceedings of an inferior kind.

The admissibility of verdicts and judgments of courts of record is the subject of the present chapter, in which will be considered, first, their admissibility, with reference to

the *parties* in the suit; secondly, their admissibility, with reference to the *subject-matter* of the suit; thirdly, the admissibility, in civil cases, of verdicts which have been given in criminal prosecutions.

Sect. I.

Of Verdicts and Judgments, with reference to the Parties in the Suit.

It is a general principle, that a transaction between two parties, in judicial proceedings, ought not to be binding upon a third; for it would be unjust to bind any person, who could not be admitted to make a defence, or to examine witnesses, or to appeal from a judgment which he might think erroneous (*a*). Hence the depositions of witnesses in another cause in proof of a fact, (*b*) the verdict of a jury finding a fact, or the judgment of the court on facts found, although evidence against the parties and all claiming under them, are not, in general, to be used to the prejudice of strangers (1). To this general rule there are some exceptions, *founded upon particular reasons, which will be stated in the course of the present chapter. * 223

(1) Judgment of De Grey, C. J. in Duchess of Kingston's case, 11 State Tr. 261.

(*a*) Vide *Jackson* d. *Schuyler and others* v. *Vedder*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 8. *Ryer* v. *Atwater*, 4 *Day* 431. *Turpin* v. *Thomas*, 2 *Hen. & Mun.* 139. But where underwriters agree to be bound by a verdict against a different underwriter on the same policy, the verdict then may be given in evidence against them. *Patton* v. *Caldwell*, 1 *Dall.* 419. Where the parties are really, though not nominally, the same in both suits, as where one suit is in the name of the person beneficially interested, and the other in that of his trustee, it has been held, that the record in the first cause was evidence in the second. *Calhoun's Lessee* v. *Dunning*, 4 *Dall.* 120.

(*b*) Vide *Lessee of Lewis* v. *Stammers*, 1 *Dall.* 2.

But although justice requires that third persons, who had no opportunity of examining witnesses in a suit, or of making a defence, should not be prejudiced by the verdict or judgment, it is on the other hand equally just, that the parties to the suit should be subject to a different rule. "From the variety of cases," said Ch. J. De Grey, in delivering his celebrated judgment in the case of the Duchess of Kingston, "relative to judgments being given in evidence in civil suits, it seems to follow as generally true, that the judgment of a court of concurrent jurisdiction, directly upon the point, is, as a plea, a bar, or, as evidence, conclusive between the same parties, upon the same matter directly in question in another court (1)." Here Ch. J. De Grey was about to consider the effect of judgments pronounced in other courts of concurrent jurisdiction: but the same principle and the same rule appear with still greater force to apply to judgments in the *same* court.

Between *same* parties.

First, then, a judgment directly upon the point, is, as a plea, a bar between the same parties. A party may be estopped by a verdict on record: as, in an action of trespass, if the defendant prescribes for common, and the plaintiff traverses the prescription, the defendant may say, that, in a former action by the plaintiff against the defendant, the same prescription was found against the plaintiff (2).

Upon the same principle, it is presumed, a judgment will be, as evidence, conclusive between the same parties, in
* 224 those cases where it can be given in evidence without *being specially pleaded. The rule has been expressly so declared with reference to the judgments of courts of *concurrent* jurisdiction (1), and it seems to be equally appli-

(1) Judgment of De Grey, C. J. in Duchess of Kingston's case, 11 State Tr. 261.

(2) Com. Dig. tit. Estoppel, (A. 1.) p. 73. citing 1 Show. 28. The case is Incledon and another v. Burges. The doubt there was, whether this was a good estoppel as against a co-plaintiff, a stranger to the former action; and the Court gave judgment on another point. On this subject, see the judgment in the case of Outram v. Morewood, 3 East 354, 5.

(1) See ante, p. 223.

cable in principle to a former judgment of the *same* court. 1. Thus, in an action of assumpsit, the defendant may either plead a judgment recovered, or give it in evidence under the general issue (2); and it is difficult to assign a reason, why the judgment should not have the same conclusive operation, if given in evidence without pleading, as it would be admitted to have, if pleaded in bar. 2. In an action of trespass for mesne profits, the judgment in ejectment is conclusive against the defendant on the right of possession at the time of the demise laid in the declaration (3). 3. A judgment of the quarter sessions discharging an order of removal, on an appeal, is conclusive evidence between the respondent and appellant parishes, that, at the time of the first order of removal, the settlement of the pauper was not with the appellants. 4. So, a record of conviction, on an indictment against a parish for not repairing a road will be conclusive evidence, on a plea of not guilty to a second indictment, of the liability of that parish to repair (4). "If the parish can show fraud, it will vitiate this or any other judgment; but, unexplained, it will be conclusive evidence*." 5. So, if the defendant, in an action of trespass, plead his soil and freehold, and give in evidence a verdict on the same plea in a former ac-
*tion between the same parties, this probably would be * 225
conclusive, that the right to the soil and freehold was at the time as found. If, indeed, the defendant in the former

(2) Per Lord Mansfield in Bird v. Randall, 3 Burr. 1353.
(3) Aslin v. Parkin, 2 Burr. 666.
(4) R. v. St. Pancras, Peake N. P. C. 219.

* Fraud, as it has been observed (1), is only put for an example. If the parish consists of several districts, which have immemorially repaired the respective highways lying within them, and if the districts, in which the road indicted is not situate, can show that they had *no notice* of the former indictment, (the defence having been made and conducted entirely by the district, within which the road lies,) the Court will consider the indictment as being substantially against that district, and give the other districts leave to plead the prescription to a subsequent indictment for not repairing the highways in the parish. R. v. Townsend, 1 Doug. 421.

(1) 2 Saund. 159. a. note by the editor.

action had pleaded not guilty, together with the plea of liberum tenementum, and a *general* verdict had been found, and this should afterwards be given in evidence, (as in the case supposed.) such a general verdict would not be *conclusive* evidence of the right, as if there had been a verdict on the plea of liberum tenementum, though it would be material evidence; and the defendant would be admitted to prove, that on the former occasion no evidence was offered except on the general issue (1). But if this general verdict were *pleaded* by way of estoppel, it would estop the plaintiff (2).

In the case of Moses v. Macferlan (3), indeed, the Court of King's Bench held, that the plaintiff might recover back money, which he had paid under a judgment obtained against him by the defendant in an action in a court of conscience, which action the defendant brought against him as indorser of a bill of exchange, in breach of a written agreement. They admitted it, however, to be a clear principle, that the merits of a judgment can never be overruled by an original suit either at law or in equity; and that the judgment is conclusive, as to the subject-matter, until it is set aside or reversed. The ground of the decision in that case was, that the breach of the agreement was no defence to the action in the court of conscience, being a collateral matter not within their cognizance. But this has been since questioned (4); and it has been thought, that the breach of the agreement went to the essence of the debt demanded, and was necessarily as much a defence in that court, as it would have been in the Court of King's Bench (*a*). The case of Moses v. Macferlan,

(1) See 3 East 364, 5. 6 T. R. 609.
(2) 3 East 365.
(3) 2 Burr. 1006. 9.
(4) By Eyre, C. J. in Philips v. Hunter, 2 H. Bl. 414. And see Marriott v. Hampton, 7 T. R. 269. Brown v. M'Kinnally, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 279.

(*a*) Matter, which would have been a good defence in an action by A. against B., cannot afterwards be made the subject of a suit by B. against A. *White* v. *Ward & Aylesworth*, 9 *Johns. Rep.* 232. *Jones* v. *Scriven*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 453.

*therefore, does not in any manner infringe, but rather confirms, the general rule, that the merits of a question, which has been directly determined by a court of competent jurisdiction, cannot be tried over again, between the same parties, in any shape whatsoever (*a*).

The authority of a former adjudication of the right prevails between the *same parties*, that is, between the same persons suing or sued in the same quality or character. A woman is not estopped, after coverture, by an admission upon record by her husband and herself, during coverture (1). So an heir, who claims as heir of his father, shall not be estopped by an estoppel upon him as heir to his mother (2). So a party suing as *executor*, in an action of debt upon a bond, will not be estopped by having been barred in an action upon the same bond, when he sued as *administrator;* but he may show that the letters of administration have been since repealed (3).

Between *privies.*

Estoppels by verdict, admissions on record, &c. bind privies in blood, (as the heir,) privies in estate, (as feoffee,

(1) Com. Dig. tit. Estoppel, (C).
(2) Ib.
(3) Robinson's case, 5 Rep. 32. b.

(*a*) Vide *Cobb* v. *Curtiss*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 470. *White* v. *Ward & Ayleswoorth*, 9 *Johns. Rep.* 232. *Moor* v. *Ames*, 3 *Caines' Rep.* 170. So, an action on the case will not lie for obtaining a decree by false and forged evidence, such decree being still in force. *Peck* v. *Woodbridge*, 3 *Day* 30. So, where an action on the case was brought in the Supreme Court of New-York against a defendant for suborning a witness to swear falsely in a cause in Connecticut, whereby judgment was given against him, contrary to the truth and justice of the case, it was held that the action would not lie. Of the two judges who delivered their opinions in this case, Spencer, J. placed the decision on the ground that no action would lie for an injury occasioned by perjury, but Kent, Ch. J. relied on the conclusiveness of the judgment in Connecticut, which it was attempted to open in a collateral action. *Smith* v. *Lewis*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 157. Money paid under an award cannot be recovered back in an action for money had and received: for the action of *indebitatus assumpsit*, though governed by equitable principles, and not

lessee, &c.) and privies in law, (as lord by escheat, tenant by curtesy, tenant in dower, the incumbent of a benefice, and others who come in by act of law in the *post*); in the same manner, persons standing in either of these relations will be bound equally with the parties themselves, by a judgment in a former action, for the same matter, if pleaded in bar (4).

A verdict or judgment, in a former action, upon the same matter directly in question, is also *evidence* for or against privies in blood, privies in estate, and privies in law, as well as for or against the parties to the suit. Thus, if an ancestor has obtained a verdict, the heir may give it in
* 227 *evidence, as privy to it (1). So, if several estates in remainder be limited in a deed, and one of the parties in remainder obtain a verdict in an action brought against him for the same land, that verdict may be given in evidence, for another person in remainder, in an action brought against him for the same land, although he does not claim any estate under the first remainder-man; because they all claim under the same deed (2). So, a verdict for or against a lessee is evidence for or against the reversioner (3). And a decree in the Court of Exchequer, in a cause between the vicar on one side and the impropriator on the other, (establishing the vicar's title to small tithes under an ancient endowment against the defendant, who insisted that he was only entitled to an annual payment in lieu of tithes,) is evidence in suits between succeeding vicars and patrons; but not conclusive evidence, as it would be, if the ordinary had been a party to the first

(4) Co. Lit. 352. a. Com. Dig. tit. Estoppel, (B). Outram v. Morewood, 3 East 346.

(1) Per Cur. in Lock v. Narbonne, 3 Mod. Rep. 142.

(2) Pyke v. Crouch, 1 Ld. Ray. 730. Com. Dig. tit. Evidence, (A. 5). Bull. N. P. 232.

(3) Per Cur. in Rushworth v. Countess of Pembroke and Currier. Hardr. 472. Com. Dig. ib. Bull. N. P. 2. 2. Gilb. Ev. 35 6.

---

to be sustained in opposition to equity, cannot be substituted for that mode of relief which belongs only to chancery. *Bulkley* v. *Stewart*, 1 *Day* 130.

suit (4). So, a judgment for or against the school-master of a hospital, concerning the rights of his office, has been admitted to be evidence for or against his successor (5). And so, where, on an information in the nature of a quo warranto against the defendant for acting as bailiff of a corporation, the defendant pleaded that he had been duly elected under a nomination by two persons, who were bailiffs of the corporation, and the point in issue was, whether they were bailiffs at the time of the election, the record of a judgment of ouster in a quo warranto against them, was adjudged to be good evidence against the defendant, who claimed under them (6)*. These cases fully establish the rule above laid *down, that a verdict or judgment, directly upon the point, is good evidence, not only for or against the parties to the suit, but also for or against any persons standing in the relation before mentioned, of privies in blood, privies in estate, or privies in law (*a*). *228

Not evidence *against* a *stranger.*

The general rule is, that a verdict cannot be evidence for either party, in an action against one who was a stranger to the former proceeding, who had no opportunity to examine witnesses, or to defend himself, or to appeal against

(4) Carr v. Heaton, 3 Gwillim 1261. See Bishop of Lincoln v. Ellis and another, 2 Gwill. 632.

(5) Lord Brounker v. Sir R. Atkins, Skin. 15.

(6) R. v. Hebden, Andr. 388; 2 Str. 1109, S. C.; Bull. N. p. 231. S. C.; 2 Selw. N. P. 1047, cited from MS. R. v. Grimes, 5 Burr. 2601. S. P.

* Judgment of ouster has been considered in the nature of a judgment *in rem.* In the case of the King v. the Mayor of York, 5 T. R. 72, where the cases of R. v. Hebden and R. v. Grimes were cited in argument, in order to show that such a judgment cannot be conclusive against third persons, Lord Kenyon is reported to have said, "If you derive title to a corporate office through A., and the prosecutor show a judgment of ouster against A. it is *conclusive* against you, unless you can impeach the judgment as obtained by fraud."

(*a*) A recovery against an executor for a debt due from his testator is not evidence in an action brought against the heirs or devisees to charge the real estate, for there is no privity between the executor and the heirs or devisees, admitting that there may be (a point not decided) between the executor and a legatee of the personalty. *Mason's Devisees* v. *Peter's Adm'rs*, 1 *Mun.* 437.

the judgment (*a*). Thus a verdict in an action between A. and B. is not evidence against a third person C. who was neither party nor privy to the first suit. The case of Green v. The New River Company (1), where Lord Kenyon said, that a verdict, obtained in an action against a person for the negligence of his servant, is evidence in a subsequent action by the master against the servant, as to the quantum of damages, is not an exception to the general rule. Such a verdict would not be evidence of the fact of the injury, but admissible only as evidence of special damages, to show the amount of what the master was by process of law compelled to pay in the action brought against himself.

It is not easy to reconcile with this general rule the case of Kinnersley v. Orpe (2), where a verdict for the plaintiff in an action for a trespass, committed in the plaintiff's fishery, against one who justified as servant, was allowed to be evidence against another defendant, in a subsequent action for a penalty incurred by destroying fish in the same fishery. At the trial of the cause this was admitted, after
* 229 *argument, to be *conclusive* evidence of the plaintiff's right of fishery; as it appeared, that the defendant in the second suit acted by the command of the same person, under whom the defendant in the first action had justified, and who was considered by the judge to be the true party in both causes. "It is extraordinary," said Lord Ellenborough (1), commenting on this case, "that it should ever have been for a moment supposed, that there could be an estoppel in such a case. It was not pleaded as such; neither were the parties in the second suit the same as those in the first. The doubt seems rather to be, whether

(1) 4 T. R. 590. And see 2 East 459.

(2) 2 Doug. 517. The Court of K. B. thought the evidence *admissible*, but not *conclusive*.

(1) In Outram v. Morewood, 3 East 366.

(*a*) Vide ante, 222 n. (*a*) *Paynes* v. *Coles and others*, 1 *Mun.* 373.

the former record in the action of trespass was at all *admissible* in evidence upon the subsequent action against the defendant, who was not a party to the former action, rather than as to any conclusive effect which it could have had."

Another case, which does not come strictly within the general rule, is where a record of conviction for felony is admissible in evidence against an accessary, to show that the felony has been committed. "The only questions," says Mr. Justice Foster (2), "in which the accessary can have any concern in common with the principal, are, first, whether the felony was committed, and secondly, whether it was committed by the principal. These facts the conviction of the principal hath established with certainty, *at least sufficient to put the accessary to his answer.* The rule is founded on a legal presumption, that every thing in the former proceeding was rightly and properly transacted. Another weighty reason is, that the witnesses against the principal may be dead, or not to be found when the accessary is brought upon his trial, especially after a long interval between the trials." Mr. Justice Foster admits, that the record of conviction is not *conclusive* evidence againt the accessary, because it is as to him, res inter alios *acta (*a*). "If, therefore, it shall come out in evidence upon the trial of the accessary, as it sometimes hath, and frequently may, that the offence, of which the principal was convicted, did not amount to felony in him, or not to that species of felony, with which he was charged, the accessary may avail himself of this, and ought to be acquitted. And if it shall manifestly appear in the course of the accessary's trial, that in point of fact the principal was innocent, common justice requires that the accessary should be * 230

(2) Fost. Disc. iii. c. 2. s. 2. p. 3 Campb. 265; R. v. Smith, 1 Leach 364., 5. 7. And see R. v. Baldwin, Cr. C. 238., 4th Ed.

(*a*) And it is competent for the person charged as accessary, to prove his principal innocent, notwithstanding his having been convicted. *Cook* v. *Field,* 3 *Esp. Rep.* 133.

acquitted." Mr. Justice Foster then puts the following case, "A. is convicted upon circumstantial evidence, strong as that sort of evidence can be, of the murder of B.; C. is afterwards indicted as accessary to this murder; and it comes out, upon the trial, by incontestable evidence, that B. is still living, (Lord Hale somewhere mentions a case of this kind,) is C. to be convicted or acquitted? The case is too plain to admit of a doubt. Or suppose B. to have been in fact murdered, and that it should come out in evidence, *to the satisfaction of the Court and Jury*, that the witnesses against A. were mistaken in his person, (a case of this kind I have known,) that A. was not nor could possibly have been present at the murder. It must be admitted," continues Mr. Justice Foster, "that mere *alibi* evidence lies under a great and general prejudice, and ought to be heard with uncommon caution; but if it appears to be founded in truth, it is the best negative evidence that can be offered; it is really positive evidence, which in the nature of things necessarily implies a negative; and in many cases it is the only evidence, which an innocent man can offer. What in the case above put, are a court and jury to do? *If they are satisfied upon this evidence that A. was innocent*, natural justice and common sense will suggest, what is to be done in the case of C."

Nor, *for* a *stranger.*

Farther, it is laid down as a general rule, that a verdict is evidence only between the same parties, or between such as claim under the same parties; and, that a stranger cannot give a verdict in evidence against one, who was party *to the former suit. Thus, it was resolved by Ch. J. Holt and the other judges of the court on a trial at bar, that no record of conviction or verdict can be given in evidence, but such whereof the benefit may be mutual, that is, such as might have been given in evidence either by the plaintiff or the defendant (1). And Ch. B. Gilbert lays it down (2),

* 231

(1) R. v. Warden of the Fleet, Rep. temp. Holt 134. Bull. N. P. 233. S. P.

(2) Gilb. Ev. 28. Bull. N. P. 232. The same principle is adopted by Eyre, C. J. in his judgment in the Duchess of Kingston's case, 11 St. Tr.

"that no body can take benefit by a verdict, who had not been prejudiced by it, had it gone contrary (*a*)." The same rule applies to depositions as well as to verdicts. Thus, if A. prefers his bill against B., and B. exhibits his bill against A. and C. in relation to the same matter, and a trial at law is directed, C. cannot give in evidence the depositions in the cause between A. and B., but the trial must be entirely as of a new cause (3) (*b*).

A judgment *in rem* in the Exchequer is conclusive as to all the world (4). And a judgment by the quarter sessions, confirming an order of removal, is conclusive upon the appellant parish, as to all the world, and may be given in evidence against them by a third parish on any subsequent appeal (5). Here it may be observed, the party, against whom the judgment was pronounced, had an opportunity of discharging themselves by proving the liability on a third parish; and this not having been done, and the court of quarter sessions having confirmed the order of removal, the last settlement is adjudged to be in the appellant parish; and, this point being once determined, the judgment must be final, that there may be some end to litigation (6). So a conviction on an indictment against a parish for not repairing a road, will not only be conclusive evidence against that parish on a second indictment, but it seems also to *have been considered as conclusive in favour of a *third* parish (1); at least, it is strong evidence. * 232

(3) Rushworth v. Countess of Pembroke and Currier, Hardr. 472.

(4) See infra, c. 3. s. 3.

(5) Admitted, R. v. Rislip, 2 Bott 700; R. v. Bently, 2 Bott 704; R. v. Sarrat, 2 Bott 702.

(6) Per Holt, C. J. in R. v. Rislip, 2 Salk. 524. 2 Bott 705.

(1) R. v. St. Pancras, Peake N. P. C. 219.

(*a*) Vide 1 *Mun.* 394. 403.

(*b*) A record of one suit cannot be read as evidence in another, on the ground that the defendant and one of the plaintiffs in the latter suit were parties to the former, and that the same point was in controversy in both; *another plaintiff*, and the person under whom the said plaintiffs *jointly* claim, not having been parties to such former suit. *Chapmans* v. *Chapman*, 1 *Mun.* 398.

It is more difficult to explain the two following nisi prius cases, which appear not to be consistent with the general rule. The first is the case of Whateley v. Menheim and Levy (2). That was an action of assumpsit for goods sold and delivered against two defendants, (one of whom suffered judgment by default, and the other defended,) and the question at the trial was, whether the defendants were partners at the time, when the goods had been delivered. To prove the partnership, a verdict, on an issue directed by the Court of Exchequer to try that fact, was offered in evidence, and objected to by the counsel on the other side on the ground, that the plaintiff was not a party to the suit in the Exchequer, so that the verdict there given was res inter alios acta. But Lord Kenyon ruled "that the verdict was conclusive evidence of a subsisting partnership, and that it could not properly be deemed res inter alios acta, as both the defendants had been the parties on record in that suit, and it was open to either of them by any evidence to rebut the idea of a partnership." The other case is that of Tyley v. Cowling (3), where it is said to have been ruled by Lord Ch. J. Holt, "that a verdict with the evidence given, in an action brought by the carrier for goods delivered to him to be carried, shall be given in evidence in an action brought by the owner against the carrier for the same goods; for it is a strong proof against him, that he had the plaintiff's goods; and, in case the witness be dead, or cannot be found, is the best evidence that can be had, for it amounts to a confession in a court of record."

The reason why a verdict is not evidence *against* a person, who was neither a party to the former suit, nor claims
* 233 *under one of the parties, is, because he had no opportunity of calling witnesses, or cross-examining those on the other side, nor of appealing against the judgment. And the reason why the verdict would not be evidence *for* a

(2) Whateley v. Menheim and Levy, 2 Esp. N. P. C. 608. See Lowfield v. Bencroft, Bull. N. P. 40.

(3) Bull. N. P. 243., cited Com. Dig. tit. Evidence, (A. 5.) p. 86. 1 Ld. Ray. 744.

stranger, even against a party who was engaged in the former suit, seems to be, because, if he had been party to that suit instead of the person who gained the verdict, the result might have been different; for, as the parties would in that case have been constituted differently, the evidence might have varied; part of the evidence might then have appeared inadmissible, or of a doubtful character, or perhaps other evidence might have been produced by the party who lost the verdict. Under such circumstances, to admit a verdict as evidence, would be giving a party indirectly the benefit of testimony, which he might be precluded from availing himself of directly in his own suit. But this reason, it is evident, only applies, where the verdict is offered in evidence, by a third person, against the party who *failed* in the former action, and not where it is produced against the party who *succeeded*. It does not therefore apply to the case above mentioned, of Tyley v. Cowling.

Exceptions.

There are several exceptions to the general rule, which requires, that verdicts or judgments should be admitted in evidence only between parties to the suit or privies. On a question of custom, or toll, a verdict is evidence, although between other parties (1): for the custom or toll is lex loci, and it is as reasonable to give in evidence a verdict between other parties, as to prove a payment of the duty by strangers. So on a question of customary right of common (2), or a public right of way (3), or on the liability to repair a highway (4), or on manorial or other customs (5), or on the public right of election to a parochial office (6), a verdict in *a former action between any other persons is admissible in evidence. The common reputation of the place would be evidence of the right; a fortiori, the finding of twelve men upon their oaths is evidence (1). On

* 234

(1) City of London v. Clarke, Carth. 181. Bull. N. P. 233.
(2) 1 East 357. 5 T. R. 413. n.
(3) Reed v. Jackson, 1 East 355.
(4) R. v. St. Pancras, Peake N. P. C. 219.
(5) Per Holt, C. J., Carth. 181. Case of the Manchester Mills, cited in Cort v. Birkbeck, 1 Doug. 222. n. (13).
(6) Berry v. Banner, Peake N. P. C. 156.
(1) Per Lawrence, J., 1 East 357. Gilb. Ev. 31. See ante, p. 182.

such questions, therefore, a verdict in an action between A. and B. is evidence of the point there directly determined, in an action between C. and D., where the same point comes in issue; but it is clearly not *conclusive* (2). And it seems not to be conclusive evidence for or against A. or B., in an action between either of them and a third person C. (3); it could not be *pleaded*, in such a case, by way of estoppel. Another exception to the general rule, says Mr. Just. Buller, is in a question of pedigree, where a special verdict, between other parties, finding a pedigree, would be evidence to prove a descent (4) (*a*). "Of this opinion," he adds, "was Mr. Just. Wright, in the Duke of Athol's case, which opinion is generally approved, though the determination of the rest of the court was contrary." The other judges considered the special verdict "inadmissible, as res inter alios acta, and, for any thing they knew to the contrary, the same evidence, that was laid before the former jury, might have been then produced (5) (*b*)."

(2) Biddulph v. Ather, 2 Wils. 23.
(3) See the cases above cited, and see Mayor of Hull v. Horner, Cowp. 111. ad fin.
(4) Bull. N. P. 233.
(5) Neal d. Duke of Athol v. Wilding and another, 2 Str. 1151.

(*a*) Vide *Pegram* v. *Isbel*, 2 *Hen. & Mun.* 193. *Lovell* v. *Arnold*, 2 *Mun.* 167.

(*b*) In an action by the vendee of a chattel against the vendor, on the implied warranty of title, the record in a previous action, in which the vendee was evicted, and of the pendency of which action the vendor had notice, is evidence. *Blasdale* v. *Babcock*, 1 *Johns. Rep.* 517. 2 *Hayw.* 351. So, in an action of covenant against the warrantor in a deed of land, the judgment of recovery against the grantee, with notice of the suit to the warrantor is evidence. *Hamilton* v. *Cutts & others*, 4 *Mass. Rep.* 349. In an action of covenant brought by the grantee against the grantor for the breach of the covenant against incumbrances, the postea in an action of ejectment brought against the grantee by a mortgagee on a prior mortgage of the same land by the grantor, is sufficient evidence to support the action. *Waldo* v. *Long*, 7 *Johns. Rep.* 173. So, where a sheriff who had taken a bond with sureties for the

Sect. II.

Of Judgments, with reference to the Subject-matter of the Suit.

The judgment of a court of concurrent jurisdiction, directly upon the point, is, as a plea, a bar, or, as evidence, conclusive, upon the *same matter* directly in question in another court (6). And it is a bar to any other action of the same nature as the first (7). By *actions of the same* **nature*, is meant, actions in a similar degree; not merely those which have a similitude of form. All personal actions are of the same degree; therefore each is a perpetual bar (1). Thus, a judgment in an action of debt, is a bar in assumpsit on the same contract (2). And a judgment in trespass, when the right of property is determined, will be a bar in trover for the same taking (3). So, a verdict for the defendant in trover is a bar in an action for money had and received, for the money arising from the sale of the

* 235

(6) See ante, p. 223.

(7) Ferrer's case, 6 Rep. 7; Cro. El. 667., S. C. Sparry's case, 5 Rep. 61. Hitchin v. Campbell, 2 Black. 827. 831.

(1) 2 Black. 831.

(2) Slade's case, 4 Rep. 94. Com. Dig. tit. Action, K. 3.

(3) Com. Dig. Ib. Putt v. Roster, 2 Mod. 319; 3 Mod. 1. S. C.; Sir T. Raym. 472, S. C. 2 Black. Rep. 831.

---

liberties of the gaol granted to a prisoner in execution was sued for an escape, of which suit the sureties had notice, and a judgment recovered against him; in an action by the sheriff on the bond against the prisoner's sureties it was held that the former judgment was conclusive evidence. *Kip* v. *Brigham & others*, 6 *Johns. Rep.* 158. S. C. 7 *Johns. Rep.* 168. So, in an action against an attorney for the loss of the evidence of a debt, the defence was that the plaintiff had another remedy for the recovery of his debt which he had successfully pursued, and it was held that the record of such recovery was evidence of the fact although the attorney was no party to it. *Huntington* v. *Rumnill*, 3 *Day* 390. Vide ante, 46, 47. n. 48. 65. 96.

same goods (4) (*a*). One great criterion for trying, whether the matter or cause of action be the same, is that the same evidence will maintain both the actions (*b*). But where the plaintiff failed in his first suit on account of some defect in pleading, or from having mistaken the form of action, the judgment will not be conclusive, and he may bring another action to try the same right (5) (*c*).

If the plaintiff, on the trial of his action, attempted to prove a demand against the defendant, and failed in the attempt, he cannot set it up again in a second action (*d*). But, if he omitted to give any evidence of the demand on the former occasion, though he had an opportunity of doing so, he is not precluded from doing it afterwards. Thus, when the plaintiff in a former action declared on a promissory note and for goods sold, but, upon executing a writ of inquiry after judgment by default, gave no evidence on the count for goods sold, the judgment was not a bar to his recovering for the goods in another action (6) (*e*). So, it has been held, that an award, made on a reference of all matters in difference between the parties, is no bar to any

(4) Hitchin v. Campbell, 2 Black. 827.

(5) Robinson's case, 5 Rep. 33. 6 Rep. 8. a. Com. Dig. tit. Action, L. 4. 2 Black. 831.

(6) Soddon v. Tutop, 6 T. R. 607.

(*a*) So, a verdict in trespass de bonis asportatis, is a bar to an action of assumpsit for the price of the same goods. *Rice* v. *King*, 7 *Johns. Rep.* 20.

(*b*) Vide *Rice* v. *King*, 7 *Johns. Rep.* 20, *Johnson* v. *Smith*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 383. *R.* v. *Emden*, 9 *East'sRep.* 436.

(*c*) Vide *Benton* v. *Duffy*, *Rep. Court of Conf.* 98.

(*d*) Vide *Brockway* v. *Kinney*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 210. *Platner* v. *Best*, 11 *Johns. Rep.* 530. *Irwin* v. *Knox*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 365.

(*e*) So, if the plaintiff in a former action joined two trespasses in the same count, and the court on motion of the defendant compelled him to elect for which trespass he would proceed, and that he should not go for both, and the jury found damages accordingly, it will not be a bar to a subsequent action, brought for the trespass which he was obliged to abandon. *Snider & Van Vechten* v. *Croy*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 227.

cause of action, which the plaintiff had against the defendant at the time of the reference, if it appear that the subject-matter *of the action was not inquired into before the arbitrator (1) (*a*). * 236

In considering the effect of a former judgment, it is to be observed that the judgment, whether it be pleaded in bar, or given in evidence where special pleading is not required, can be final only for its own proper purpose and object, with reference to the subject-matter of the suit, and upon the points there put in issue and directly determined (*b*). Therefore, in an action for obstructing a watercourse, where a verdict for the plaintiff in a former action, which had been brought against the defendant for another obstruction to the same watercourse, was offered in evidence under the general issue, Lord Mansfield held, that the plaintiff had not obtained such a determination of his right, by the former verdict, as the law considered conclusive (2). And this decision has been recognized and confirmed in a very elaborate judgment, before referred to, on the nature of estoppels (3) (*c*).

(1) Ravee v. Farmer, 4 T. R. 146.

(2) Sir F. Evelyn v. Haynes, cited in Outram v. Morewood, 3 East, 365.

(3) Per Ld. Ellenborough in Outram v. Morewood, ib.

(*a*) Contra. *De Long* v. *Stanton*, 9 *Johns. Rep.* 38. *Wheeler* v. *Van Houten*, 12 *Johns. Rep.* 311.

(*b*) Vide *Ryer* v. *Atwater*, 4 *Day* 431. In that case Swift, J. says, that when there are several distinct facts which constitute the points contested between the parties, no authority can be found that will warrant the admission of a verdict as evidence to prove one of the several facts put in issue. In the cases reported the verdict goes to the whole point in issue, and not to a part of the facts: and this distinction is founded in reason; for where the facts are different, the same points precisely cannot be in evidence.

(*c*) In order to make a record evidence to conclude any matter, it should appear that that matter was in issue, which should appear from the record itself; nor should evidence be admitted that under such a record any particular matter came in question. *Sintzenick* v. *Lucas*, 1 *Esp. Rep.* 43. *Manny* v. *Harris*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 24.

A judgment in one action of ejectment is not conclusive in another, in consequence of the fictitious nature of the proceedings. However, it is conclusive evidence of the plaintiff's title, against the tenant in possession, in an action for mesne profits; for the plaintiff to entitle himself to recover in an ejectment, must show a possessory right not barred by the statute of limitations. This judgment, like all others, only concludes the parties, as to the *subject-matter.* It proves nothing, *beyond* the time laid in the demise; because, beyond that time the plaintiff has alleged no title, nor could be put to prove any. As to the length of time also, during which the tenant has occupied, or as to the value, the judgment proves nothing, for the same reason (4) (*d*).

*237 *There is a difference, it has been said, between real actions and personal actions, as to the conclusiveness of a judgment. "In a personal action, as debt, account, &c. the bar is perpetual; for the plaintiff cannot have an action of a higher nature, and has no remedy but by error or attaint (1). But if the plaintiff be barred, in a real action, by judgment on a verdict, demurrer, confession, &c. yet he may have an action of a higher nature, and try the same right again; because it concerns the freehold and inheritance (2)." Now, although it is true that the same matter may be thus tried again, yet the former judgment is no less conclusive upon the immediate right then in demand, as far as that former judgment purports to bind, and against all such persons, as it is competent by law to bind (3). A judgment is final for its own proper purpose and object, and no further. A recovery in any suit, upon issue joined on matter of title, is conclusive upon the subject-matter. Thus, a finding upon title in trespass not only operates as a bar to the future recovery of damages for

(4) Aslin v. Parkin, 2 Burr. 668.
(1) 1st Resol. Ferrer's case, 6 Rep. 7.
(2) See the judgment in Outram v. Morewood, 3 East 359.
(3) Ib. 354.

(*d*) Vide *Baily and others* v. *Fairplay*, 6 *Binney* 450.

a trespass founded upon the same injury, but operates also as an estoppel to any action for an injury to the same supposed right of possession (3).

Sect. III.

Of the Admissibility, in Civil Cases, of Verdicts in Criminal Proceedings.

It does not appear to be clearly settled, whether verdicts, which have been given in criminal proceedings, can be admitted as evidence in civil cases. In the case of Hillyard and Grantham (4), which was an issue directed by the Court of Chancery to try a question of legitimacy, a sentence, against the supposed father and mother, upon a proceeding against them in the Consistory Court of Lincoln, for living together in fornication, was offered *in evidence, to prove that they were not married; but the whole Court of King's Bench were of opinion, on a trial at bar, that the sentence could not be given in evidence; "because, first, it was a criminal matter, and could not be given in evidence in a civil cause; next, because it was res inter alios acta, and could not affect the issue: but they held, that, if it had been a sentence on the point of marriage in a question on the lawfulness of the marriage, it might have been given in evidence, being the sentence of a court having proper jurisdiction." * 238

And in the case of Gibson v. Maccarty (1), on an issue to try the genuineness of some promissory notes, depositions of a deceased witness having been read on the part of the plaintiff, (in which depositions the witness swore, that the defendant had acknowledged the notes in question and also another note,) it was proposed, on the part of the

(3) See the judgment in Outram v. Morewood. 3 East 359.

(4) Cited by Lord Hardwicke in Brownsord v. Edwards, 2 Ves. 245. and in Rep. temp. Hard. 311.

(1) Rep. temp. Hard. 311.

defendant, to show by a record of conviction, that the plaintiff had since been convicted of forging this other note, mentioned by the deponent; for such evidence, it was said, would go to the credit of the deponent's evidence, as to the acknowledgment of the notes in question; and, secondly, because there is at all times a liberty given to examine into the plaintiff's character. But this evidence was opposed on the part of the plaintiff, (on the ground, that no record of a criminal action can be given in evidence in a civil suit, because such a conviction might have been upon the evidence of a party interested in the civil action,) and Lord Hardwicke is reported to have said, "that the general rule was as had been stated by the plaintiff's counsel (2), and that it had been so strictly kept, that in the case of the Hillyards, on a question of legitimacy, the Court refused to admit a sentence of excommunication in the spiritual court for fornication between the father and mother of the party, whose legitimacy was impeached."

* 239 *In a third case (1) to be found on this subject, upon an issue to try the question of devise or no devise, a coroner's inquest, finding the deceased a lunatic, was offered in evidence against the plaintiff, who claimed as executrix, for the purpose of showing, that the deceased was incompetent to make a will; this evidence was objected to on the part of the plaintiff, and the court were equally divided in opinion. The Chief Justice (Parker) was of opinion that the inquest ought to be admitted, "because it was for the plaintiff's advantage, as the personal estate would be saved by the finding of lunacy," and he added, that in Lord Derby's case an inquest post mortem was allowed to be given in evidence. Mr. Justice Powys agreed with the Chief Justice. Mr. Justice Eyre said, "This is a criminal matter, and ought not to be given in evidence in a civil proceeding. A verdict on an indictment for battery cannot be read in an action for the same battery. An inquest

(2) Acc. per Sir J. Mansfield, C. J. in Hathaway v. Barrow and Others, 1 Campb. 151.

(1) Jones v. White, Tr. at bar, 1 Str. 68.

post mortem is in the nature of a civil proceeding, but this is criminal, for it might induce a forfeiture of the goods, if he had been found felo de se." And Mr. Justice Pratt said, "If a verdict be given in evidence it must be between the same parties, and, therefore, an indictment at the suit of the king cannot be read in an action at the suit of the party.

The objections, then, against the admissibility of such evidence, seem to be, first, that the parties are not the same in the civil suit as in the criminal case; and secondly, that the party in the civil suit, on whose behalf the evidence is supposed to be offered, might have been a witness on the prosecution. On the other hand, it may be said, that, although the prosecution was conducted in the name of the king, no kind of injustice can be done to the defendant in admitting the record of conviction as evidence against him on the points there in issue, since he had a full opportunity at the trial of defending himself, and, if he *could, of disproving the charge: and, with regard to the second objection, it cannot, at least, apply to cases where the party, who offers the judgment in evidence, was not in fact a witness on the prosecution, or where from the nature of the case he could not have been admitted. *240

Mr. Justice Buller lays down the rule generally (1), "that a conviction in a court of criminal jurisdiction is conclusive evidence of the fact, if it afterwards come collaterally in controversy in courts of civil jurisdiction. As, suppose the father convicted on an indictment for having two wives, this, he says, would be conclusive evidence in an action of ejectment, where the validity of the second marriage is in dispute*". However, it seems very ques-

(1) Bull. N. P. 245.

* In support of this, the case of Boyle v. Boyle (1) is cited; where, a woman, who was libelled in the spiritual court in a cause of jactitation of marriage, applied to the Court of King's Bench for a prohibition, suggesting that the complainant had been convicted of bigamy in marrying her; and the Court of King's Bench granted the prohibition. The best report

(1) 3 Mod. 164. Comberb. 72. S. C.

tionable whether the verdict, in such a case, would be admitted as *conclusive*. In the Duchess of Kingston's case (2), Lord Ch. J. Eyre, in delivering his judgment, said, that if an offender is convicted of felony on confession, or is outlawed, not only the time of the felony, but the felony itself may be traversed by a purchaser, whose conveyance would be affected, as it stands; and even after a conviction by verdict, he may traverse the time.

If the rule is, as Mr. Justice Buller has laid down, that a record of conviction may be given in evidence, on the same matter in a civil suit, it must be understood at least
* 241 *with this limitation, that the party aggrieved was not a witness on the prosecution. To admit the record as evidence on any other condition, would be in effect to allow the party to a suit to give evidence for himself. The record, in such a case, seems upon every principle inadmissible; and the rule must be the same, whether the conviction was founded solely on the prosecutor's testimony, or whether his testimony was corroborated by other evidence. Thus, on a trial for perjury committed in an answer to a bill of injunction, the person who was sued by the defendant in an action then pending, and who in consequence filed the bill, was thought to be a competent witness (1), on the ground that a conviction, procured by his testimony, could not be used by him for obtaining relief in equity against the defendant's action at law (2). So a conviction for an assault before a magistrate, on the information of the injured party, is not evidence in an action for the same assault (3). Ch. B. Gilbert seems indeed to have been of opinion, that, where the verdict in the criminal

(2) 11 St. Tr. 261.

(1) R. v. Boston, 4 East 581. Burdon v. Browning, 1 Taunt. 521.

(2) Bartlet v. Pickersgill, 4 East 577. n. (*b*).

(3) Smith v. Rummens, 1 Campb. 9.

of this case is in Comberbach, whence it appears that Holloway, C. J. and Allibone, J. granted the prohibition against the opinion of Powell, J., "because, they said, the libel is for jactitation, and the ecclesiastical court will not allow the plea." Nothing further is to be found in the case, to support the general position laid down by Mr. Justice Buller.

prosecution is supported by other testimony, besides that of the party who wishes to avail himself of it in the civil suit, there the verdict may be properly received in evidence: for, though the verdict, he says, may be diminished in point of authority by showing that it was partly founded on the oath of the party interested in the action, yet the jury ought to respect it no further than as they presume it was given and supported by other witnesses not concerned in the cause (4)." It may still, however, be objected, that the fact might have found credit from the party's oath, and since this evidence is so intermixed, that it cannot appear on what the jury relied, the verdict ought not to be admitted at all as evidence.

Though a conviction, says Mr. Justice Buller, in a court of criminal jurisdiction is conclusive evidence of the fact, *if it afterwards come collaterally in controversy in a court of civil jurisdiction; yet an acquittal, which does not, like a conviction, ascertain facts, is no proof of the reverse (1). * 242

(4) Gilb. Ev. 26.

(1) Bull. N. P. 245. Gilb. Ev. 32. A verdict of not guilty, on an indictment against a parish for not repairing a road, is said not to be evidence for the parish on a second indictment. R. v. St. Pancras, Peake N. P. C. 219. As to acquittals in the exchequer, see infra, c. 3. s. 3. ad fin.

CHAP. III.

On Judgments of Courts of exclusive Jurisdiction.

The great principle on this subject is, that a judgment of a court of exclusive jurisdiction, directly upon the point, is conclusive, between the same parties, upon the same matter coming incidentally in question in another court for a different purpose; but that the judgment either of a court of concurrent or exclusive jurisdiction is not evidence of any matter, which came collaterally in question, though within their jurisdiction, nor of any matter incidentally cog-

nizable, nor of any matter to be inferred by argument from the judgment (2).

But, although such sentences are conclusive, and cannot be impeached from within, yet, like all other acts of the highest judicial authority, they are impeachable from without (3). Fraud is an extrinsic collateral act, which vitiates the most solemn proceedings of courts of justice. Lord Coke says, it vitiates all judicial acts, whether ecclesiastical or temporal (4).

In treating of this subject, it is proposed to consider,

1. Sentences of Ecclesiastical Courts: 2. Sentences of Courts of Admiralty, and of Foreign Courts: 3. Judgments
* 243 *in rem in the Exchequer, and by Commissioners of Excise: 4. Sentences by a College in one of the Universities, and Convictions before Magistrates.

Sect. I.

Of Sentences in the Ecclesiastical Courts.

Spiritual courts have the sole and exclusive cognizance of questioning or deciding directly the legality of marriage. And the temporal courts have an inherent power of deciding incidentally as far as temporal rights are concerned, either upon the fact or legality of a marriage, when they form a part of some more general issue within their cognizance, or are in some way connected with the decision of the proper object of their jurisdiction. But where, in civil causes, the temporal courts find the question of marriage directly determined by the ecclesiastical court, they receive the sentence as conclusive proof of the fact, it being an authority accredited in a judicial proceeding by a court of competent jurisdiction (1). They receive it upon the same

(2) 11 State T. R. 261. Judgment of Ch. J. De Grey in Duchess of Kingston's case.

(3) Ib. 262.

(4) Fermor's case, 3 Co. Rep. 78. b.

(1) Judgment of De Grey, C. J. 11 St. Tr. 261. Bunting's case, 4

principles, and subject to the same rules, by which they admit the acts of other courts. A sentence of nullity, therefore, and a sentence in affirmance of marriage, have been received as conclusive evidence on a question of legitimacy arising incidentally upon a claim to a real estate (2). So, a sentence in a cause of jactitation has been received as evidence against a marriage, upon a title in ejectment, and in personal actions immediately founded on a supposed marriage (2). In all these cases, said C. J. De Grey (3), the parties to the suit, or at least the parties against whom the evidence was received, were parties to the sentence, and had acquiesced under it, or claimed *under those who were parties and had acquiesced. And, * 244
in general, the sentences of the spiritual court are not evidence, except against the parties to the suit in which the judgment was given, or against those claiming under them. To make them conclusive against strangers, would be giving them an effect beyond what a judgment in the courts of common law is allowed to have. In a few particular instances, indeed, namely, where issue is joined on the record in certain real writs, on the legality of marriage, or, its immediate consequence, general bastardy, or on the fact of profession or deprivation, in those cases upon the issue so formed the mode of trying the question is by reference to the ordinary, and his certificate, when returned and entered on record in the temporal courts, is a perpetual and conclusive evidence against all the world on that point (*a*); which exceptionable extent was the occasion of a statute in the reign of Henry the Sixth, requiring certain public pro-

Co. Rep. 29. Kenn's case, 7 Co. Rep. 42. Jones v. Bow, Carth. 225. Da Costa v. Villa Real, 2 Stra. 960.

(2) 11 State Tr. 261.
(3) Ib.

(*a*) All issues upon legality of marriage, and upon pleas or allegations of general or special bastardy, shall be tried by the country and not otherwise. *Laws of New-York*, Sess. 36. c. 4. s. 5. 1 R. L. 326.

clamations to be made, for persons interested to come in and be parties to the proceeding (1).

A sentence in a cause of jactitation, also, is evidence against a marriage, and has been received as such, upon a title in ejectment, and in personal actions immediately founded upon a supposed marriage (2); but it will not, like a sentence of nullity, be *conclusive* evidence. They are sentences of a very different nature and operation. A cause of jactitation is ranked as a cause of defamation only, and not as a matrimonial cause, unless when the defendant pleads a marriage: and whether it continues a matrimonial cause throughout, as some say, or ceases to be so on failure of proving a marriage, still the sentence has only a negative and qualified effect, namely, that the party has failed in his proof, and that the libellant is free from all matrimonial contract "as far as yet appears," leaving it open to new proofs of the same marriage in the same cause, or to
* 245 any *other proofs of that or any other marriage in another cause; and if such sentence is no plea to a new suit in the ecclesiastical court, and is not conclusive there, it cannot conclude another court, which receives the sentence, from going into new proofs to make out that or any other marriage (1). Admitting the sentence in its full extent and import, it only proves that it did not yet appear that the parties were married, and not that they were not married at all; and, by the rule laid down by Ld. Ch. J. Holt (2), such sentence cannot be proof of any thing to be inferred by argument from it; and therefore it is not to be inferred that there was no marriage at *any* time or place, because the court had not then sufficient evidence to prove a marriage at a *particular* time and place. In the Duchess of Kingston's case, therefore, on a charge of polygamy, where a sentence in the spiritual court in a cause of jactitation of marriage was offered as conclusive evidence to disprove the second marriage, the judges held, that this sentence,

(1) See the judgment by De Grey, C. J., 11 St. Tr. 261.
(2) 11 St. Tr. ib.

(1) 11 St. Tr. 261.
(2) Blackham's case, 1 Salk. 290.

(even admitting it to be evidence on a criminal prosecution,) could not be conclusive, but that the sentence and the judgment of the Lords might well stand together, and both propositions be true. The sentence would only prove, that it did not then appear that the parties were married; but, because the court had not then sufficient proof of the marriage specified, it could not be inferred, that there was no marriage between them at any other time or place.

The ecclesiastical courts have also exclusive authority in deciding on the validity of wills of things personal, and in granting administration (3). And their sentences, pronounced in the exercise of this sole and exclusive jurisdiction, are so binding on the temporal courts, as to be conclusive evidence of the right directly determined (*a*). Thus a probate unrepealed is conclusive evidence, in civil cases, of the validity of a will; and therefore payment of money to an executor, who has obtained probate of a forged will, is *a discharge to the debtor of the intestate, though the probate be afterwards declared null and void (1). But the sentence is evidence only of the point directly determined; it will not be evidence of any collateral matter, which may possibly be collected or inferred from the sentence by argument (2). * 246

The adverse party may show that the probate is forged, because such evidence supposes, that the spiritual court has given no judgment; or, if the probate was granted by an inferior court, that the testator left bona ratabilia, for then the court had not jurisdiction (3). But evidence will not

(3) Noel v. Wells, 1 Lev. 235. 1 Ld. Ray. 262. 3 T. R. 130.
(1) Allen v. Dundas, 3 T. R. 125.
(2) Blackham's case, 1 Salk. 290. See ante, p. 245.
(3) 1 Sid. 359. Bull. N. P. 247.

(*a*) Vide *Bush* v. *Sheldon*, 1 *Day* 170. *Judson & Wife* v. *Lake*, 3 *Day* 318. These cases show that a decree of a court of probates, respecting a will is, in Connecticut, conclusive as to the real property. The law is said to be the same in Massachusetts and Rhode-Island. *Spencer* v. *Spencer*, *Rep. C. C. U. S. First Circt.* 622.

be admitted, to prove, that another person was appointed executor, or that the testator was insane (4): that would be to falsify the proceedings of the ordinary in cases where he is exclusive judge. The probate of a will, devising real property, is not evidence of the contents of the will (5), even though the original is proved to be lost (6); the spiritual court having no power to authenticate such a devise, as far it relates to land.

It appears then, that the sentence of an ecclesiastical court, directly upon a point within its peculiar jurisdiction, is conclusive on the same matter, coming incidentally into question in a civil case in another court. But although the law stands thus with regard to civil suits, proceedings in matters of crime, and especially of felony, fall under a different consideration (7); first, because the parties are not the same, for the king, (in whom the trust of prosecuting public offences is vested, a trust executed by his immediate orders, or in his name by some prosecutor,) is not a party to such proceedings in the ecclesiastical court, and cannot be admitted to defend, examine witnesses, or in any
* 247 *manner intervene or appeal: secondly, such doctrine would tend to give the spiritual courts, which are not permitted to exercise any judicial cognizance in matters of crime, an immediate influence in trials for offences, and to draw the decision from the course of common law, to which it solely and peculiarly belongs. The case of the King v. Vincent (1), therefore, (where the probate of a will is said to have been admitted as conclusive evidence of its validity, on an indictment for the forgery of the same will,) has been frequently much questioned, and at length expressly overruled (2).

For the same reason, a sentence in a spiritual court on the question of marriage will not preclude inquiry on a cri-

(4) 1 Lev. 236.
(5) Bull. N. P. 245.
(6) Doe d. Ash v. Calvert, 2 Campb. 389. Hoe v. Nathrop, 1 Ld. Ray. 154. St. Leger v. Adams, ib. 731. Dike v. Polhill, ib. 744.
(7) 11 St. Tr. 261.
(1) 1 Str. 481.
(2) R. v. Gibson, Lanc. Sum. Ass. 1802, before Ld. Ellenborough, C. J. stated by Mr. Evans in the 2d vol. of his edition of Pothier, p. 356.

minal charge of polygamy; unless it is made to have such an effect by an express provision of the legislature. Now, by the statute of 1 J. 1. c. 11. which makes polygamy a felonious offence, and for the trial of this offence necessarily gives to the temporal courts a cognizance of the lawfulness of marriage, it is provided that the act "shall not extend to any persons divorced by a sentence in the ecclesiastical court, nor to any persons where the former marriage has been by the ecclesiastical court declared null and void (*a*)." There are two cases, then, put by the statute, in which the sentence of the ecclesiastical court will protect against the criminal inquiry, namely, sentence of divorce and sentence of nullity of marriage (3). But the statute makes no exception in favour of a sentence in a cause of jactitation: and as such a sentence is not conclusive even in the court where it was delivered, and declares not directly but only collaterally the invalidity of marriage, it has been adjudged not to be a bar to a criminal prosecution (4).

It has been before mentioned, that judgments and sentences of courts of justice, or any other judicial act, may *be impeached by evidence of fraud or collusion. And such evidence was adjudged to be admissible, on the part of the prosecution, in the case of the Duchess of Kingston, who was tried for polygamy. A distinction, in this respect, has been made between the case of a stranger, (who cannot * 248

(3) 1 East P. C. 467.

(4) Duchess of Kingston's case, 11 St. Tr. 260.

(*a*) The statute of the state of New-York has a like exception of persons who shall be at the time of the second marriage divorced by the sentence or decree of any court having cognizance thereof, and where the former marriage has been by the sentence or decree of any such court, declared to be void and of no effect. Sess. 11. c. 24. 1 R. L. 113. Hence, according to the principle stated in the text, if the party, *on whose complaint*, a divorce for adultery was decreed by the court of chancery, marry again, and be indicted for polygamy, the decree of the chancellor will be conclusive evidence in favour of the defendant.

come in and reverse the judgment, and therefore of necessity he must be permitted to aver, that it was fraudulent,) and the case of a party to the proceedings, (who cannot give evidence of fraud, but must apply to the court, which pronounced the judgment, to vacate it;) and therefore, in the case Prudham v. Phillips (1), where the defendant proved her marriage with one M., in answer to which a sentence of an ecclesiastical court was produced, showing that she was at the time married to another person, Chief Justice Willes, after much debate, refused to allow the defendant to prove that the sentence had been obtained by fraud.

Sect. II.

Of Sentences in Courts of Admiralty and Foreign Courts.

The Judge of the Admiralty has the sole and exclusive cognizance in questions of prize or not prize at sea (2). The true reason of this rule is, that prizes are acquisitions jure belli, and the jus belli is to be determined by the law of nations, and not by the particular municipal law of any country. A sentence therefore in the prize court, deciding the question of prize, is conclusive, in all it professes to decide, on the same point incidentally arising in courts of common law. "It has been clearly settled, (said the Master of the Rolls in the case of Kindersley against Chase (3),) from the time of Lord Hale down to the present period, that a sentence of condemnation in a court of admiralty is
*249 conclusive, when *it proceeds on the ground of enemy's property, that the property belongs to enemies, and not only for the immediate purpose of such a sentence, but it is binding on all courts and against all persons. The sen-

(1) Ambler, 763. cited by the L. Ch. from a MS. note of Sergt. Parker.

(2) Tompson v. Smith, 1 Sid. 320. Brown v. Frankly, Carth. 476. Le Caux v. Eden, 2 Doug. 600. Lindo v. Rodney, n. (1). ib.

(3) Cockpit, July 1801, Park Insur. last edit. 490.

tence of a court of admiralty proceeding in rem, must bind all parties, must bind all the world."

The sentence of a foreign court of admiralty, also, which is acknowledged by the law of nations, and of competent jurisdiction, deciding the question of property, is conclusive, if the same question arise in this country (1) (*a*). And though in the case of Hughes and Cornelius, the leading case on this subject, the question upon the foreign sentence arose in an action of trover, and not in an action on a policy of assurance, (where the non-compliance with a warranty of neutrality is in dispute,) yet, from that period down to the present, the doctrine there laid down has been considered equally applicable to questions of warranty in actions on policies, as to questions of property in actions of trover (2). And it may now be assumed as the settled doctrine of courts of English law, that all sentences of foreign courts, (*b*) of competent jurisdiction to decide questions of prize, are to be received here as conclusive evidence in actions upon policies of assurance, on every subject immediately and properly within the jurisdiction of such foreign courts, and upon which they have professed to decide judicially (3). It

(1) Hughes v. Cornelius, 2 Show. Rep. 232. Sir T. Ray. 473. S. C. Bernardi v. Motteux, 2 Doug. Rep. 575.

(2) Per Chambre, J., Lothian v. Henderson, 3 Bos. & Pull. 513.

(3) Bolton v. Gladstone, 5 East 160. Christie v. Secretan, 8. T. R. 196. Kindersley v. Chase, Park Ins. 486.

(*a*) Vide *Rose* v. *Himely*, 4 *Cranch* 241. *Stewart* v. *Warner*, 1 *Day* 142. *Jenkins* v. *Putnam*, 1 *Bay* 8. *Cheriot* v. *Foussat*, 3 *Binney* 220.

It is not necessary in order to prove a condemnation to produce any thing more than the libel and sentence; although it is a frequent but useless practice to read the proceedings at length. 6 *Cranch* 220. *Condy's Marsh.* 706. n. And the decree alone has been held sufficient, if it state the material facts. 7 *Johns. Rep.* 519.

(*b*) The capture must first be proved, as a foundation for introducing the sentence in evidence. *Marshall* v. *Parker*, 2 *Campb.* 69.

is now too late, said Mr. Just. Lawrence (4), to examine the practice of admitting these sentences to the extent to which they have been received, supposing that practice might at first have appeared doubtful. On the authority of those decisions men have acted for a long series of years, and entered into contracts of assurance in this country, with a knowledge of such decisions, and in expectation that the
* 250 *questions, arising out of such contracts, to which the decisions are applicable, will be ruled by them. Such a sentence of condemnation will be binding on the rights of third persons, as well as on the parties to the original suit; it is conclusive between the assured and the underwriter, with respect to every fact which it professes to decide (*a*). Thus, when it proceeds on the ground of enemy's property, it is conclusive, that the property belongs to enemies, not only for the immediate purpose of such a sentence, but it is binding on all courts and as against all persons (1). And the sentence is binding, whether it proceed to condemn the ship expressly as being enemy's property, or whether such a ground of decision can only be collected from other parts of the proceedings; and this, although it appear on the face of the sentence, that the prize-court arrived at the conclusion through the medium of rules of evidence and rules of presumption, established only by

(4) Lothian v. Henderson, 3 Bos. & Pull. 524. See also Baring v. Clagett, 3 Bos. & Pull. 214.

1 Kindersley v. Chase, Park Ins. 490.

(*a*) Acc. *Croudson and others* v. *Leonard*, 4 *Cranch*, 434. 6 *Cranch* 45. *Dempsey* v. *Insurance Company of Philadelphia*, 1 *Binney* 299. n. *Baxter et al.* v. *New England Marine Insurance Company*, 6 *Mass. Rep.* 277. *S. C.* 7 *Mass. Rep.* 275. *Brown* v. *Union Insurance Company*, 4 *Day* 179. 4 *Dali.* 424. *Condy's Marsh.* 706. n.

The Supreme Court of the state of New-York had decided in a variety of instances in conformity with the English doctrine, (vide 1 *Johns. Cas.* 341. 2 *Johns. Cas.* 127. 174. 1 *Johns. Cas.* 16. 2 *Caines' Cas. in Error* 348.) in favour of the conclusiveness of the sentence of a foreign court of admiralty as between insurer and in-

the particular ordinances of their own country, and not admissible on general principles (2).

The sentence is conclusive evidence of the points upon which it professes to decide (3). Thus, for example, if it proceeded upon the ground of the property not being neutral, it is conclusive against the insured, that he has not complied with his warranty (4) (*b*). If no special ground is stated, and the ship is condemned generally as lawful prize, it is to be presumed from the condemnation, as no other cause appears, that the sentence proceeded on the ground of the property belonging to an enemy; and the sentence, in such a case, has been held to be conclusive evidence, that the property was not neutral (5) (*c*). In

(2) Bolton v. Gladstone, 5 East, 155. 2 Taunt. 85. Baring v. Roy. Ex. Ass. Comp. 5 East 99.

(3) Christie v. Secretan, 8 T. R. 196. See also (3), ante, p. 249.

(4) Barzillay v. Lewis, Park Insur. last edit. 469. Baring v. Clagett, 3 Bos. & Pull. 201.

(5) Saloucci v. Woodmass, Park Ins. 471. (1784.) 8 T. R. 444.

---

sured; but a contrary doctrine was finally established by the decision of the Court of Errors in *Vandenheuvel* v. *The United Insurance Company*, 2 *Johns. Cas.* 451. and such sentence was held to be no more than prima facie evidence of the facts which it contains. *Johnston* v. *Ludlow*, 2 *Johns. Cas.* 481. *Laing* v. *United Insurance Company*, *Ibid.* 487. *Goix* v. *Low*, *Ibid.* 480. *Kemble* v. *Rhinelander*, 3 *Johns. Cas.* 130. *Radcliff* v. *United Insurance Company*, 9 *Johns. Rep.* 277. Nevertheless the decision of a prize court is conclusive as to the property, in an action of trover. *Wheelwright* v. *Depeyster*, 1 *Johns. Rep.* 471. The legislature of Pennsylvania have settled the law in that state against the conclusiveness of the sentences of Prize Courts, further than as respects the property.

(*b*) Vide n. (*a*) supra. So if it proceed on the ground of a breach of blockade, it is conclusive of that fact. *Croudson and others* v. *Leonard*, 4 *Cranch* 434. And where the sentence stated a condemnation for a breach of blockade, and *for other sufficient reasons*, without stating them, the Court rejected the latter words as surplusage. *Baxter et al.* v. *New England Marine Insurance Company*, 6 *Mass. Rep.* 277.

(*c*) Sed vide *Fisher* v. *Ogle*, 1 *Campb.* 418. Lord *Ellenborough* there held that as the sentence did not say that the ship

the case of Bernardi v. Motteux (6), where there was some
* 251 ambiguity *in the sentence, so that the precise ground of the determination could not be collected, the Court of King's Bench considered themselves at liberty to examine, whether the ground on which the sentence proceeded, but which was not stated, actually falsified the warranty con-

(6) 2 Doug. 574. (1781.) 3 Bos. & Pull. 215.

---

was not *American*, it was not to be considered as evidence of what it did not specifically affirm. A verdict having been found for the insured, the Court of King's Bench refused to grant a rule to show cause why there should not be a new trial; and Lord Ellenborough said; "I must look to the adjudicative part of the sentence, and there I find nothing distinctly stated as to the ship or her cargo not being American. Have you any case in which it was held that judges must fish for a meaning, when a sentence of this kind is produced to them? Here the foreign court seems not to have formed any settled opinion upon the subject, and not to have known or cared on what grounds it proceeded to a condemnation. It is by an overstrained comity that these sentences are received as conclusive evidence of the facts which they positively aver and upon which they specifically profess to be founded." In a case in Massachusetts, subsequent to that of *Baxter* v. *N. E. Insurance Company* cited supra, a majority of the court (Parsons, C. J. and Parker, J.) lay down the rule, that when it does not appear by the decree itself on what particular ground the condemnation was had, the case is to be open to evidence, as to all the points which it may be necessary for parties in interest here to establish, except the fact of condemnation. "Now if we look," says the Ch. J. "to the adjudicative part of the sentence in this case, we find the ship was condemned as good and lawful prize: if we look for reasons, we shall find that she was so condemned, because she had been rescued, *or otherwise:* that is for the reason specifically set forth, *or* for some other reason which is not stated. Upon the whole I think that we go full far enough in holding sentences to be conclusive, when they distinctly and specifically state the causes of condemnation: but that parties in this country, to contracts made here, ought not to be bound by a trial in a foreign forum, in any cases, but those which come strictly within the judicial decisions upon the subject." *Robinson and another* v. *Jones*, 8 *Mass. Rep.* 536. Et vide *Vasse* v. *Ball*, cited infra 251. n.

tained in the policy (*a*). Hence it follows, that it does not lie on the party, who produces the sentence, to show that it has proceeded on the ground of enemy's property; but it is incumbent on the other party, who objects to the sentence, to show that it proceeded on some other ground (1).

Where the sentence professes to be made on particular grounds, which are set forth in the sentence, but which appear not to warrant the condemnation, the sentence will not be conclusive as to such facts (2). Or if the sentence has not decided the question of property, nor declared whether it be neutral, but condemned the property as prize solely on the ground that the ship had violated an *ex parte* ordinance, to which the neutral country had not assented, or on the ground of a foreign ordinance against the law of nations, such a sentence, though conclusive of the question of prize or no prize, would not be conclusive of the fact, whether or not the ship were neutral (3). Lastly, sentences of condemnation in foreign courts of prize are admissible only, where such courts are constituted according to the law of nations, and exercise their functions either in the belligerant country, or in the country of a co-belligerant or ally in the war (4). It has, therefore,

(1) Kindersley v. Chase, Park Ins. 490.

(2) Calvert v. Bovil, 7 T. R. 523. 8 T. R. 444.

(3) Pollard v. Bell, 8 T. R. 444. Bird v. Appleton, 8 T. R. 562. Baring v. Clagett, 3 Bos. & Pull. 215. Bolton v. Gladstone, 2 Taunt. 85. 95.

(4) Oddy v. Bovil, 2 East 473.

(*a*) Where the property was warranted neutral, and the libel stated several grounds of forfeiture, and the sentence of condemnation was general, without specifying any particular cause of forfeiture, it was held that the assured, notwithstanding the sentence, might show that the property was American. *Vasse* v. *Ball*, 2 *Dall.* 270. Where the libel stated one ground of forfeiture (as enemy's property) and the vessel was condemned on another ground, (as breach of blockade,) it was held that here was such uncertainty and ambiguity that the parties might go into extrinsic evidence. *Blacklock* v. *Stewart*, 2 *Bay* 363.

the case of Bernardi v. Motteux (6), where there was some
* 251 ambiguity *in the sentence, so that the precise ground of the determination could not be collected, the Court of King's Bench considered themselves at liberty to examine, whether the ground on which the sentence proceeded, but which was not stated, actually falsified the warranty con-

(6) 2 Doug. 574. (1781.) 3 Bos. & Pull. 215.

---

was not *American*, it was not to be considered as evidence of what it did not specifically affirm. A verdict having been found for the insured, the Court of King's Bench refused to grant a rule to show cause why there should not be a new trial; and Lord Ellenborough said; "I must look to the adjudicative part of the sentence, and there I find nothing distinctly stated as to the ship or her cargo not being American. Have you any case in which it was held that judges must fish for a meaning, when a sentence of this kind is produced to them? Here the foreign court seems not to have formed any settled opinion upon the subject, and not to have known or cared on what grounds it proceeded to a condemnation. It is by an overstrained comity that these sentences are received as conclusive evidence of the facts which they positively aver and upon which they specifically profess to be founded." In a case in Massachusetts, subsequent to that of *Baxter* v. *N. E. Insurance Company* cited supra, a majority of the court (Parsons, C. J. and Parker, J.) lay down the rule, that when it does not appear by the decree itself on what particular ground the condemnation was had, the case is to be open to evidence, as to all the points which it may be necessary for parties in interest here to establish, except the fact of condemnation. "Now if we look," says the Ch. J. "to the adjudicative part of the sentence in this case, we find the ship was condemned as good and lawful prize: if we look for reasons, we shall find that she was so condemned, because she had been rescued, *or otherwise:* that is for the reason specifically set forth, *or* for some other reason which is not stated. Upon the whole I think that we go full far enough in holding sentences to be conclusive, when they distinctly and specifically state the causes of condemnation: but that parties in this country, to contracts made here, ought not to be bound by a trial in a foreign forum, in any cases, but those which come strictly within the judicial decisions upon the subject." *Robinson and another* v. *Jones*, 8 *Mass. Rep.* 536. Et vide *Vasse* v. *Ball*, cited infra 251. n.

tained in the policy (*a*). Hence it follows, that it does not lie on the party, who produces the sentence, to show that it has proceeded on the ground of enemy's property; but it is incumbent on the other party, who objects to the sentence, to show that it proceeded on some other ground (1).

Where the sentence professes to be made on particular grounds, which are set forth in the sentence, but which appear not to warrant the condemnation, the sentence will not be conclusive as to such facts (2). Or if the sentence has not decided the question of property, nor declared whether it be neutral, but condemned the property as prize solely on the ground that the ship had violated an *ex parte* ordinance, to which the neutral country had not assented, or on the ground of a foreign ordinance against the law of nations, such a sentence, though conclusive of the question of prize or no prize, would not be conclusive of the fact, whether or not the ship were neutral (3). Lastly, sentences of condemnation in foreign courts of prize are admissible only, where such courts are constituted according to the law of nations, and exercise their functions either in the belligerant country, or in the country of a co-belligerant or ally in the war (4). It has, therefore,

(1) Kindersley v. Chase, Park Ins. 490.

(2) Calvert v. Bovil, 7 T. R. 523. 8 T. R. 444.

(3) Pollard v. Bell, 8 T. R. 444. Bird v. Appleton, 8 T. R. 562. Baring v. Clagett, 3 Bos. & Pull. 215. Bolton v. Gladstone, 2 Taunt. 85. 95.

(4) Oddy v. Bovil, 2 East 473.

(*a*) Where the property was warranted neutral, and the libel stated several grounds of forfeiture, and the sentence of condemnation was general, without specifying any particular cause of forfeiture, it was held that the assured, notwithstanding the sentence, might show that the property was American. *Vasse* v. *Ball*, 2 *Dall.* 270. Where the libel stated one ground of forfeiture (as enemy's property) and the vessel was condemned on another ground, (as breach of blockade,) it was held that here was such uncertainty and ambiguity that the parties might go into extrinsic evidence. *Blacklock* v. *Stewart*, 2 *Bay* 363.

been determined, that a sentence pronounced by the authority of the capturing power, within the dominions of a *neutral* country, to which the prize may have been taken, is illegal (5), and consequently would not be admissible evidence to falsify the warranty of neutrality (*b.*)

* 252 Judgments of other foreign courts.

*The sentence of any other foreign court of competent jurisdiction, directly deciding a question which was properly cognizable by the law of the country, seems to be conclusive here, if the same question arise incidentally between the same parties in this country. Thus the sentence of a foreign court of competent jurisdiction, directly establishing a marriage in that country, would be conclusive, in any of our courts, on the validity of the marriage (1).

(5) Havelock v. Rockwood, 8 T. R. 268. Case of the Flad Oyen, 8 T. R. 270. n. (*a*); 1 Rob. Adm. Rep. 135.

(1) Per Lord Hardwicke, in Roach v. Garvan, 1 Ves. 159.

(*b*) It is not only necessary that the court should be constituted in conformity to the law of nations, but also that the subject matter should be within its jurisdiction; therefore a sentence of condemnation pronounced by a prize court, upon property lying in the ports of another nation, not an ally of the captor, is invalid, and does not work a change of the property. The want of jurisdiction, then, being an objection to the competency of the proceedings, it follows that the sentence is not conclusive as to the jurisdiction of the court pronouncing it, but that their authority may be inquired into by another court, in another country, when called on to decide whether the right of property has been changed. *Rose* v. *Himely*, 4 *Cranch* 241. *Wheelwright* v. *Depeyster*, 1 *Johns. Rep.* 471. Sed vide *Cheriot* v. *Foussat*, 3 *Binney* 220. where it was held that it was not necessary in order to give jurisdiction to a prize court that the property captured should have been brought within the dominions of the captor: that seizure and safe possession are all that are necessary to give jurisdiction, and whether the possession be within the dominions of the captor, or of a neutral, is immaterial. The Court, however, expressly decided that they might inquire into the jurisdiction of the prize court, and if found to possess jurisdiction its decrees were conclusive.

So, where a party, having accepted a bill of exchange drawn upon him at Leghorn, instituted a suit there, in which suit his acceptance was vacated, and, upon his return to this country, being sued again on his acceptance, applied to the court of Chancery for an injunction and relief against the second action, Lord Chancellor King decided that the cause was to be determined by the law of the country where the bill was negotiated, and, as the acceptance had been there declared void by a competent jurisdiction, he thought the sentence must here also be conclusive (2). So on a criminal charge, as for murder committed in a foreign country, an acquittal in that country might be pleaded here in bar to an indictment for the same offence (3); because, says Mr. Justice Buller, a final determination in a court having competent jurisdiction is conclusive in all courts of concurrent jurisdiction (4). From the two last cases, the following principle seems to be properly deducible, namely, that a party, who has been once discharged from a criminal charge or a legal demand by the sentence of a foreign court of competent jurisdiction, may protect himself by that sentence against any fresh suit or prosecution instituted here for the same cause (*a*).

If an action is brought in this country, as an action of debt or assumpsit, directly upon a foreign judgment, the

(2) Burrows v. Jemino, 2 Stra. 733.

(3) Hutchinson's case, cited 1 Show. Rep. 6; also in 2 Str. 733. 1 Leach Cr. C. 160. acc.

(4) Bull N. P. 245. Roche's case,

(*a*) A vessel, having been captured by a French privateer, was carried into a port in one of the Spanish colonies, and there dismantled and abandoned. The vessel having stranded on the beach, was some months after sold at auction by the commanding officer of the port, and purchased by the defendant, who repaired her and brought her to New-York; in an action of trover brought by the original owner, it was held that the vessel being abandoned, and a wreck, and having been sold according to the laws of Spain, in cases of wreck or derelict, the property was transferred by the sale to the purchaser, who thereby acquired a valid title against all the world. *Grant & Swift* v. *M'Lachlin*, 4 *Johns. Rep.* 34.

sentence has been considered prima facie evidence of the
* 253 *debt, but not conclusive (*a*). Lord Kenyon, indeed, in the case of Galbraith v. Neville (1), which was an action of debt on a judgment in the supreme court of Jamaica, said he entertained serious doubts concerning the doctrine laid down in the case of Walker v. Witter (2), that foreign judgments are not binding upon the parties here; and after referring to a case, which might seem to point against his opinion, he added, "that is not an authority for saying that we can revise the judgments of the lowest courts in foreign countries, where they have competent jurisdiction." However, Mr. Just. Buller, in the same case said, "The doctrine which was laid down in the case of Sinclair v. Fraser, has always been considered the true line ever since, namely, that the foreign judgment shall be prima facie evidence of the debt, and conclusive, till it be impeached by the other party." "As to actions of this sort," he continued, "see how far the court would go, if what was said in the case of Walker v. Witter were departed from. It was there held, that the foreign judgment was only taken to be prima facie evidence, that is, we will allow the same force to a foreign judgment, that we do to those of our own courts not of record (3): but if the matter were carried farther, we should give them more credit; we should give them equal force with those of courts of record here. Now a foreign judgment has never been considered as a record: it cannot be declared on, as such, and a plea of nul tiel record, in such a case, is a mere nullity. How then can it have the same obligatory force? In short, the result is this; that it is prima facie evidence of the justice of the demand in an action of assumpsit, having no more credit than is given to every species of written agreements, name-

(1) 1 Doug. Rep. 5. n. (2); and 5 East 475. n. (*b*). S. C.
(2) 1 Doug. 1.
(3) Acc. Ld. Mansfield in Herbert v. Cook, Willes' Rep. 37. n. (*a*).

(*a*) Vide *Buttrick & Wife* v. *Allen*, 8 *Mass. Rep.* 273. 9 *Mass. Rep.* 464. 3 *Johns. Rep.* 169.

ly, that it shall be considered as good, till it is impeached." And, in the case of Philips v. Hunter (4), Eyre, C. J. said, "It is in one way only that the sentence or judgment of the court of a foreign state is examinable in our courts, *and that is, when the party who claims the benefit of it applies to our courts to enforce it. When it is thus voluntarily submitted to our jurisdiction, we treat it not as obligatory to the extent to which it would be obligatory perhaps in the country in which it was pronounced, nor as obligatory to the extent to which, by our law, sentences and judgments are obligatory, not as conclusive, but as matter *in pais*, as a consideration prima facie sufficient to raise a promise. We examine it, as we do all other considerations of promises, and for that purpose we receive evidence of what the law of the foreign state is, and whether the judgment is warranted by the law (*a*)." * 254

(4) 2 H. Black. 410., in error.

(*a*) The 1st sect. of the 4th article of the constitution of the United States declares that, "Full faith and credit shall be given in each state to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other state. And the Congress may, by general laws, prescribe the manner in which such acts, records, and proceedings shall be proved, and the effect thereof." By virtue of the power granted them, congress, by an act of May 26, 1790, (Laws U. S. vol. 1. p. 115.) after prescribing the mode of authentication of public acts, &c. declare, that "the said records and judicial proceedings authenticated as aforesaid, shall have such faith and credit given to them in every court within the United States, as they have by law or usage in the courts of the state from where the said records are, or shall be taken." What is the construction of this act of congress; what is the effect of a judgment in one state, when produced in evidence in another; whether it is to be received as conclusive evidence of a debt, or to be regarded in the same light as foreign judgments are by the English courts? are questions in the decision of which the courts in different states have essentially varied from each other.

Where an action was brought in the circuit court of the Pennsylvania district on a judgment obtained in New-Jersey, the plea

Sect. III.

On Judgments in rem in the Exchequer, and by Commissioners of Excise.

A judgment of condemnation in the court of Exchequer, where proceedings in rem have been instituted, is conclusive evidence in any other court, as to all the world, that the goods were liable to be seized (1). The jurisdic-

(1) Scott v. Shearman, 2 Black. Rep. 979. Per Ld. Kenyon, C. J. in Geyer v. Aguillar, 7 T. R. 696. Bull. N. P. 244.

---

of nil debet was held bad. If the plea, says Wilson, J. would be bad in the courts of New-Jersey, it is bad here; for whatever doubts there might be on the words of the constitution, the act of congress effectually removes them; declaring in direct terms, that the record shall have the same effect in this court, as in the court from which it was taken. In the courts of New-Jersey no such plea would be sustained: and, therefore, it is inadmissible in any court sitting in Pennsylvania. *Armstrong* v. *Carson's Exrs*, 2 *Dall.* 302.

In an action of debt brought in Massachusetts, on a judgment recovered in New Hampshire, on a promissory note, the defendant pleaded, that at the time of signing the note and making the promise, he was an infant, and that during all the time between the time of making the note and promise, and the recovery of the judgment, he was an inhabitant of, and resident in, Massachusetts: the plaintiff demurred to the defendant's pleas, and judgment was given against the demurrer. *Bartlett* v. *Knight*, 1 *Mass. Rep.* 401. But in a subsequent case in the same court, which was an action on a judgment in New Hampshire, in which process had been personally served on the defendant, a majority of the court, (Parsons, C. J. and Parker, J.; contra Sedgwick, J. who relied on the authority of *Bartlett* v. *Knight*,) held that the defendant should not be permitted to impeach the judgment. "Judgments, says Parsons, Ch. J. rendered in any other of the United States are not, when produced here as the foundation of actions, to be considered

tion of the court of Exchequer in this case is not only competent, but sole and exclusive: and though no formal or express notice is given to the owner of the goods in person, yet he has sufficient notice to try the point of for-

---

as foreign judgments, the merits of which are to be inquired into, as well as the jurisdiction of the courts rendering them. Neither are they to be considered as domestic judgments, rendered in our courts of record, because the jurisdiction of the courts rendering them is a subject of inquiry. But such judgments, so far as the court rendering them had jurisdiction, are to have in our courts full faith and credit. They may therefore be declared upon as evidences of debts or promises, and on the general issue the jurisdiction of the courts rendering them is put in issue, but not the merits of the judgment." *Bissell* v. *Briggs*, 9 *Mass. Rep.* 462.

The law on this subject was settled in the state of New-York, in the case of *Hitchcock & Fitch* v. *Aicken*, 1 *Caines' Rep.* 460; in which it was held by three justices, (Lewis, Ch. J. Kent, and Radcliff, Js.) against two, (Livingston, J. and Thompson, J.) that a judgment in another state, in an action on that judgment, was to be regarded as a foreign judgment; and that the constitution and act of congress merely required that credit should be given to its contents, but that the effect or operation of it remained as at common law. Such a judgment, therefore, is only prima facie evidence of a debt. *Taylor* v. *Bryden*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 173. An action of assumpsit will lie upon it, and the defendant may plead, whether the action be debt or assumpsit, the statute of limitations. *Hubbell* v. *Coudrey*, 5 *Johns. Rep.* 132.

A judgment obtained in another country or in another state, in a suit commenced without personal service of process on the defendant, is not even prima facie evidence of a debt; on such a judgment no assumpsit can be implied. *Buchanan* v. *Rucker*, 9 *East* 192. *Kibbe* v. *Kibbe*, *Kirby* 119. *Buttrick & Wife* v. *Allen*, 8 *Mass. Rep.* 273. As where the suit is commenced by attachment on the defendant's goods, who is himself a non-resident. *Kilburn* v. *Woodworth*, 5 *Johns. Rep.* 37. *Phelps* v. *Holker*, 1 *Dall.* 261. *Robinson* v. *Exrs of Ward*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 86. And it has been held in the state of New-York that no action would lie upon a judgment obtained in another state against a person resident in New-York, in an action commenced by the service on the defend-

feiture, by the seizure of his property, by the proclamations according to the course of the court, and by the writ of appraisement.

Whether a condemnation by the commissioners of excise ought to have the same conclusive operation, as a judgment of condemnation in the court of Exchequer, has not been clearly settled. In the case of Henshaw v. Pleasance, which was an action of trespass, brought against a revenue *officer, for seizing goods supposed to have been irregularly lodged and concealed, a sentence of condemnation by commissioners of excise was offered as conclusive evidence against the plaintiff; but Mr. Just. Blackstone, who tried the cause (1), refused to admit it to that extent, directing the jury that such a sentence was evidence, but not, like a condemnation in the Exchequer, conclusive. On a motion afterwards for a new trial, upon this supposed misdirection, the Court of Common Pleas confirmed the judge's opinion. "The reasons and authorities, it was said, relied on in the case of Scott v. Shearman, and other cases of the same kind, extend only to condemnations in the Exchequer, which is the king's supreme court of revenue, but not to the inferior jurisdiction of the boards of excise and customs."

*255

From the report of the case of Scott v. Shearman (2), it

(1) Lond. Sitt. 1778, 2 Blac. Rep. 1174. (2) 2 Blac. Rep. 979.

---

ant, while in the state of New-York of a rule to show cause, such service being void, as well on general principles, as by the statute *to preserve and support the jurisdiction of the state*, although the rule to show cause was in the nature of a sci. fa. to charge the defendant *de bonis propriis*, grounded on a previous judgment obtained against him in a representative capacity. *Fenton* v. *Garlick*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 194. But where the defendant pleaded in an action brought in Connecticut on a judgment recovered in Massachusetts, that at the time the former suit was commenced he was not an inhabitant of Massachusetts, or resided or had property there, the plea was held bad because it did not deny notice. *Smith* v. *Rhoades*, 1 *Day* 168.

appears, that the ground of Mr. Just. Blackstone's opinion was, "that implicit credit ought to be given to any judgment *in a court of record*, which has competent jurisdiction of the subject-matter, and that the jurisdiction of the court of Exchequer was in such a case not only competent, but sole and exclusive." The opinions of C. J. De Grey and the other Judges are not reported. They agreed in thinking the judgment of condemnation in the court of Exchequer conclusive evidence of the right of seizure, but it does not appear, whether they thought it conclusive on the ground of its being a judgment of a court of record. Nor is this reason stated as the ground of determination in any of the authorities referred to by Mr. Just. Blackstone. A different principle was certainly established in the case of the Duchess of Kingston (3), where De Grey, C. J. in an elaborate judgment delivered the unanimous opinion of the Judges; and it is observable, that he pronounced this judgment within a year after the determination of the court in *the case of Scott and Shearman. The principle there * 256
established is not confined to the judgments of courts of record, some of which are of a very inferior description, but extends equally to every court of competent or exclusive jurisdiction; and the examples cited by C. J. De Grey, in illustration of this principle, are all drawn from the proceedings in ecclesiastical courts, none of which are classed among courts of record. It seems therefore correct to infer, from the rule established in the Duchess of Kingston's case, as well as from analogy to several cases mentioned in the course of the present chapter, that a sentence of condemnation by commissioners of excise will be conclusive, on the right of seizure coming incidentally into question in any other court, in all cases where by act of parliament they have a sole or exclusive jurisdiction.

In support of this position, the following authorities may be cited. First, in an action of trover against commissioners of excise (1), for levying the plaintiff's goods by

(3) See ante, p. 242.

(1) Terry v. Huntington and others, Hard. 480., cited by Holt, C. J. in Dr. Groenvelt v. Dr. Burwell, 1 Ld. Raym. 471.

their warrant under statute 12 C. 2. c. 23., the point was, whether, after they had adjudged low wines to be strong wines perfectly made, their judgment could be drawn in question again, so as to make the officers chargeable. The court gave judgment for the plaintiff, on the ground, that the defendants had exceeded their jurisdiction. Rainsford, B. said, that the defendants might well enough have justified by virtue of an authority from the commissioners of excise, who are judges of the fact, and whose authority is not traversable by the plaintiff, and that the plaintiff here must have taken his remedy by appeal and no otherwise. But if the commissioners exceed their authority, and that appear to the court, then their proceedings are coram non judice, and an action of trespass lies. But if that does not appear, it must be otherwise. Hale, C. B., and the other judges present, argued to the same effect.

* 257 *In another case, which was an action of trespass against commissioners of excise (1) for taking the plaintiff's money, the defendants pleaded not guilty, and gave in evidence their warrant and a judgment against the plaintiff, on an information against him for an offence against an excise law. It was objected on behalf of the plaintiff that this judgment was not peremptory, and that the plaintiff in this action was at liberty to disprove the truth of the matter of fact, upon which the defendants grounded their judgment. But this was denied by the court, and a distinction was taken, namely, that if the commissioners had intermeddled with a thing which was not within their jurisdiction, then all is coram non judice, and that may be given in evidence upon this action; but it is otherwise, if they are only mistaken in their judgment in a matter within their cognizance, for that is not inquirable, otherwise than upon an appeal.

A third case may be cited to the same effect. In an

(1) Fuller v. Fotch, cor. Holt, C. J., Carth. 346. Rep. temp. Holt, 287., S. C.

action of trover for a quantity of tea (2), it appeared in evidence that the plaintiff sent the tea for one Lloyd with a permit, but the porter in his way called at the house of one R., and set it down there, where the defendant, an excise officer, seized it as forfeited, for being brought to R.'s house for R.'s use, without a permit to that place according to the statute 10 G. 1. c. 10. s. 16. Upon not guilty pleaded, the defendant, to show that the property was out of the plaintiff, produced a condemnation by the commissioners of excise upon an information against R. for receiving this tea without a permit, which sentence, it was insisted, was conclusive evidence of that fact, being a judgment before a proper jurisdiction. On the other side it was insisted, that the plaintiff was no party to the suit; that R. had nothing to do with the tea; and that, if he made a feigned defence, or, as the case was, made default, yet the plaintiff ought not to be affected by that, but might *show, that this was a case not subject to forfeiture. But Lee, C. J. said, "The judgment of forfeiture is a judgment on the thing itself. How the tea came to R.'s house was a matter proper for the consideration of the commissioners; and, if the plaintiff was willing to have defended the suit, he might have come in pro interesse suo, which as he has not done, his property is bound. There is no more in this than the common case, namely, that courts of law pay such deference to the judgment of each other in matters within their jurisdiction, that the first determination by a proper authority ought to prevail; so that, the tea being forfeited, the property could not be in the plaintiff." And upon this the plaintiff was nonsuited. * 258

An acquittal in the Exchequer was considered by Lord Kenyon, in the case of Cook v. Sholl (1), to be conclusive evidence of the illegality of the seizure. That was an action of trover for several pipes of wine seized by the defendant for want of a permit. At the trial of the cause,

(2) Roberts v. Fortune, cor. Lee, C. J., sittings after Easter term 1742, 1 Hargr. Law Tracts, p. 468. n. from Ford's MS.

(1) 5 T. R. 255., and see a case in 12 Vin. Ab. (A. b. 22.) pl. 1. cor. Price, B. acc.

the plaintiff gave in evidence a record of acquittal in the court of Exchequer. The defendant then insisted, that, under the circumstances of this case, the permit had expired before the seizure was made; and Mr. Just. Heath, who tried the cause, was of that opinion; but, on its being suggested, that there had been a different determination in the court of Exchequer, he reserved the point for the opinion of the court of King's Bench, with liberty to enter a verdict for the defendant, if it should be adjudged for him. When the case came before the court, Lord Kenyon thought the record of acquittal precluded all reasoning on the construction of the permit: but as the question respecting the judgment of acquittal was not upon the record, and the only question was on the construction of the permit, a verdict was entered for the defendant. This case, therefore, has not determined, that an acquittal in the
* 259 *Exchequer would be conclusive evidence of the illegality of a seizure, although certainly that appears to have been the opinion of Lord Kenyon. It may be observed, that an acquittal does not, like a conviction, ascertain any precise fact. The sentence might have proceeded on the ground, that sufficient evidence was not produced, on the part of the crown to warrant the seizure; and, though the sentence may be conclusive as against the crown, it seems reasonable, that it should not have such a conclusive operation, in an action for seizing the property, against a third person, who was not a party with the crown in the original proceedings, and had no notice or opportunity for supporting the condemnation (*a*.)

(*a*) In an action of trespass against the collector and surveyor of the customs of the port of New-York, for the illegal seizure of a vessel, it was held on a bill of exceptions, taken at the trial, that the sentence of restitution of the vessel, in the district court of the United States, was conclusive evidence of the illegality of the seizure. *Hoyt.* v *Gelston & Schenck*, 13 *Johns. Rep.* 141. The judgment of the Supreme Court was affirmed in the court of

Sect. IV.

Of Sentences by Members of a College, Convictions before Magistrates, &c.

The principle, which has been before laid down as applicable to the sentences of courts of justice, seems to apply equally to the judicial proceedings of other tribunals, which are invested with an exclusive or peculiar jurisdiction.

Sentence of expulsion by a college.

A sentence of deprivation or expulsion of one of the members of a college, by the master and fellows, or by the visitor on an appeal, upon a subject within their jurisdiction, is conclusive in courts of law. And the justice of their decision cannot be questioned even in the King's Bench, though it belongs to that court to control them, if they exceed the bounds of their jurisdiction. On this principle, a mandamus, to restore the fellow of a college, has been frequently refused (1). In the case of Philips v. Bury, it was decided, on an appeal to the House of Lords, that a sentence of deprivation, by the visitor of a college, *was conclusive evidence in an action of ejectment for one of the college estates; and the judgment of the court of King's Bench, which had been given on the opinions of three judges against the opinion of Lord Holt, was reversed (1). And in the last case on this subject, which was a prosecution for an assault in turning out of a college one who had been expelled, the Court of King's Bench determined, that evidence, to impeach the sen- * 260

(1) Dr. Widrington's case, 1 Lev. 23. Dr. Patrick's case, 1 Lev. 65. Case of New College, 2 Lev. 14.

(1) Philips v. Bury, Skin. 447. 1 Ld. Raym. 5. S. C.

---

errors during their sitting in 1816; but I have understood that the defendants have since brought a writ of error into the Supreme Court of the United States.

tence of expulsion, had been properly rejected at the trial (2).

Convictions by magistrates.

A conviction by a justice of the peace, who has competent jurisdiction, is, till reversed or quashed, conclusive evidence in favour of the justice, in an action against him for false imprisonment (*a*). Thus in the case of Strickland against Ward (3), tried before Mr. Just. Yates, (which was an action of trespass and false imprisonment against the defendant, a justice of the peace,) the defendant produced in evidence, under the general issue (4), a warrant signed by him, reciting a conviction of the plaintiff for unlawfully returning to a parish, whence he had been removed, and requiring the keeper of a house of correction to keep the plaintiff to hard labour; he also produced the conviction, referred to in the warrant, regularly drawn up: Mr. Just. Aston, upon this, gave his opinion, "that the conviction could not be controverted in evidence, but that, as the justice had a competent jurisdiction of the matter, his judgment was conclusive, till reversed or quashed; and that it could not be set aside at nisi prius." The plaintiff was accordingly nonsuited (*b*). But where the magistrate has committed to prison, not having any jurisdiction, he will be liable to an action for false imprisonment, though the conviction has not been reversed or quashed (5); as, where the plaintiff was convicted and
*261 *committed to prison for destroying game, though, as it was proved, he had effects which might have been distrained, sufficient to answer the penalty, (the statute of 5 & 6 Ann. c. 14. enacting that the penalty is to be levied by distress and sale of the offender's goods, and, *for want*

(2) R. v. Grundon, Cowp. 315.
(3) At Winchester sum. ass. 1787, from a MS. note in 7 T. R. 633. 12 East 75. 16 East 21.
(4) St. 7 Jac. 1. c. 5.
(5) Hill v. Bateman, 2 Str. 710. Crepps v. Durden, Cowp. 640. Morgan v. Hughes, 2 T. R. 225.

(*a*) Vide *Mather* v. *Hood*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 44.

(*b*) So, if a justice commit for a contempt, the warrant of commitment is conclusive evidence of the contempt, in favour of the justice. *Laing* v. *Bentham*, 2 *Bay* 1.

of distress, the offender to be committed to the house of correction) (1); or, where the justice has committed to prison, on mere suspicion, without any information laid before him (2).

It is reported to have been held (3), that, where actions for false imprisonment are brought against justices of peace, they are obliged to show the regularity of their convictions; and that the informations laid before them, upon which their convictions are founded, must be produced and proved in court. But it appears from later authorities (4), that, in such collateral proceedings, the informality of the warrant of commitment, or of the conviction, cannot be taken advantage of by the plaintiff; and that, if the magistrate was warranted in taking cognizance of the charge, and did in fact convict, this will be sufficient to protect him, however irregularly the conviction may have been drawn up (5). It may also be collected from the late case of Gray v. Cookson (6), that, if the magistrate had a general jurisdiction over the subject-matter, evidence of facts not stated in the conviction is not admissible, to prove that the conclusion drawn by the magistrate was erroneous.

It is a general rule, with respect to special and limited jurisdictions, that where a person acts as judge, (that is, where he has over the subject-matter a general jurisdiction, which he has not exceeded,) he will not be liable to have his judgment examined in an action brought against *him (1). When therefore in pursuance of such judicial authority he has convicted a party, the facts, upon which the conviction is grounded, cannot be traversed (2). So * 262

(1) 2 Str. 710.
(2) 2 T. R. 225.
(3) Hill v. Bateman, cor. Raymond, C. J., 2 Str. 710.
(4) Massey v. Johnson, 12 East 67. And see Gray v. Cookson and Clayton, 16 East 13.
(5) Where a conviction has been quashed, the magistrate is protected in certain cases, by st. 43 G. 3. c. 141.
(6) 16 East 21. 23. See also 7 T. R. 633. n.
(1) Marshalsea case, 10 Rep. 76. Dr. Groenvelt v. Dr. Burwell, 1 Ld. Ray. 454. 467; 1 Salk. 396 S. C. Miller v. Seare, 2 Black. Rep. 1145. See also Ackerley v. Dr. Parkinson and Mawdesley, Hill. term 1815.
(2) 1 Ld. Ray. 467.

where a statute provides, that the judgment of commissioners, appointed by the act, shall be final, their decision is conclusive, and cannot be questioned in any collateral proceeding. It has therefore been held, that a certificate from commissioners for settling the debts of the army, stating that so much was due from the defendant (an army-agent) to the plaintiff (an officer), was conclusive in an action brought to recover the money; and that no evidence could be received to show, that the commissioners had formed a wrong judgment (3).

(3) Moody v. Thurston, 1 Str. 481. ruled by Pratt, C. J.; and a new trial afterwards refused by the whole court. See also Lane v. Hegberg, Bull. N. P. 19; Earl of Radnor v. Reeve, 2 Bos. & Pull. 391.

CHAP. IV.

Of certain other judicial Proceedings.

We proceed now to treat of the admissibility of certain other judicial proceedings; and in the present chapter it is proposed to consider the admissibility of proceedings in Chancery, of depositions, inquisitions, examinations taken under acts of parliament, judgments of inferior courts, and, lastly, of awards.

Sect. I.

Of Proceedings in Chancery.

Decree.

A decree in the Court of Chancery may be given in evidence on the same footing, and under the same limita-
*263 *tions, as the verdict or judgment of a court of common law (1) (*a*).

(1) See ante, p. 223.

(*a*) A decree finding a fact immaterial to the issue in Chancery, is not admissible in a subsequent suit at law between the same parties, to prove such fact. *Hotchkiss* v. *Nichols*, 3 *Day* 138.

Bill.

The common opinion used to be, that a bill in Chancery, which had been followed up by other proceedings, was admissible in evidence, as an admission of facts, against the complainant (2). "The allegations in the bill, it was said, must be supposed to be true: nor is it to be presumed, that the bill was preferred by a counsel or solicitor, without the privity of the party himself (2)." However, it is notorious that many of the facts stated in the bill are the mere suggestions of counsel, made for the purpose of extorting an answer from the defendant. The general rule therefore is, that a bill in Chancery will not be evidence, except to show that such a bill did exist, and that certain facts were in issue between the parties, in order to introduce the answer or the depositions of witnesses (3); it is not to be admitted as evidence, in courts of law, to prove any facts either alleged or denied in the bill (4). Lord Kenyon, indeed, is reported to have admitted a bill in Chancery, filed by an ancestor, to be evidence of a pedigree there stated, as a declaration in the family (5). But it was resolved by the judges in the Banbury peerage case, on a question put to them by the House of Lords, that a bill in equity, or depositions, cannot be received in evidence in the courts below, on the trial of an action of ejectment, against a party not claiming or deriving in any manner under the plaintiff or defendant in the Chancery suit, either as evidence of the facts therein deposed to, or as declarations respecting pedigree (6). And even if the bill or depositions could be received, some extrinsic proof must be given of the relationship between the complainant and the party whose pedigree *is disputed. It would not be sufficient, that the bill purports to have been filed by a relation. In the Banbury peerage case before mention- * 264

(2) Snow v. Philips, 1 Sid. 221; Gilb. Ev. 42. Woollett v. Roberts, 1 Chan. Cas. 64. contra.

(3) Lord Ferrers v. Shirley, Fitzgib. 196. Bull. N. P. 235. Bowerman v. Sybourn, 7 T. R. 3. 1 Wightw. 325.

(4) Banbury Peerage case, reported from MS. in 2 Selw. N. P. 635.

(5) Taylor v. Cole, sitt. after Hil. term 1799, 7 T. R. 3. n.

(6) MS. case, in 2 Selw. N. P. 635; Feb. 1809. See also Berkeley Peerage case, supra, p. 178.

ed, where C. D.'s legitimacy was in question, the claimant offered in evidence a bill filed in C. D.'s name by E. F. his uncle and next friend, stating his legitimacy, but there was no proof that E. F. was his uncle: the judges, being referred to for their opinion, were unanimous, that extrinsic proof of the relationship was essential, and the bill, which was above 150 years old, was accordingly rejected (1).

Answer.

Answers in Chancery are confessions on oath, and therefore strong evidence against the party that makes them. But when an answer is read, all the parts must be taken together, connected, and entire. If only a part is read in evidence, the other party is entitled to have the whole read (2) (*a*); and if, on exceptions being taken, a second answer is put in, the defendant may insist upon having that also read, to explain what he swore in his first answer (3). This is the general rule, when an answer of either party to the suit is given in evidence against him, to prove a point in issue. But if an answer is produced, merely for the purpose of showing the incompetency of a witness, who has in his answer admitted himself interested in the event of the cause, that part only is to be read which states the ground of interest (4); for if the witness is incompetent, his evidence ought not to be received in any form; on the other hand, if he is competent, he ought to be examined viva voce in open court.

When you read the answer of a party, says Ch. B. Gilbert, the confession must be all taken together: you shall not take only what makes against him, and leave out what *265 *makes for him; for the answer is read as the sense of the party (1). But, although the defendant may regularly in-

(1) MS. case in 2 Selw. N. P. 685; Feb. 1809. See also Berkeley Peerage case, supra, p. 178.

(2) Per Holt, C. J. Lynche v. Clarke, 3 Salk. 153. Earl of Bath v. Battersea, 5 Mod. 9.

(3) R. v. Carr, 1 Sid. 418. Bull. N. P. 237. See ante, p. 79.

(4) Sparin v. Drax, trial at bar, Bull. N. P. 238.

(1) Gilb. Ev. 44. See ante, p. 79.

(*a*) 11 *Johns. Rep.* 260.

sist on having the whole of the answer read, that, by comparing the several parts with each other, the true meaning and extent of the admissions may be more clearly understood, it will not therefore follow, that all the parts of his statement are equally credible, or that every thing which he asserts, is to be admitted as strictly proved. If, for example, he states a fact, not from his own knowledge, but on mere report, that would not be evidence in his favour; as, on the other hand, it would not be evidence against him, in case he had acknowledged the report to be different. The objection is, not that he speaks in his own behalf, for that difficulty is waived by the other party, who offers the answer in evidence, but, that he speaks from hearsay, and has not the means of knowledge, which alone can be resorted to. In the case of Roe on demise of Pellatt and Others against Ferrars (2), where the defendant gave in evidence an answer by the lessors of the plaintiff, Mr. Justice Chambre, observing upon the degree of positive proof, which the lessors of the plaintiff had drawn from the answer in their own favour, expressed himself thus, "It is true, that the answer was introduced into the cause by the defendant, in whose behalf some parts of it were read. But, in those parts on which the lessors of the plaintiff relied, they speak only to what "they have heard as truth." I think that was not admissible evidence, for it appears to me, that where one party reads a part of the answer of the other party in evidence, he makes the whole admissible only so far as to waive any objection to the competency of the testimony of the party making the answers, and that he does not thereby admit, as evidence, all the facts, which may happen to have been stated by way of hearsay only, in the course of the answer to a bill filed for discovery. This point, he added, does not indeed appear to have been contested *at the trial. Had it been contested, I should have thought the court bound to send the case down for a new trial." * 266

(2) 2 Bos. & Pull. 542. 548.

An answer in a court of equity is evidence against the party who made it, and against all persons claiming under him (*a*). Thus, an answer to a bill filed in the Court of Exchequer, on a claim of tithe hay, by a vicar against the rector and others, (occupiers of lands in the parish), will be evidence, in an action by a succeeding rector, for not setting out the tithe, against the defendant who claims under one of those occupiers; and it is equally admissible in evidence, although a decree is not shown to have been made in the suit (1). Proof of an examined copy will be sufficient proof of the answer (2).

The answer of a minor by his guardian is not evidence against him (3); because, in reality, it is the guardian's answer. The guardian is sworn, not the minor, who possibly may know nothing of its contents. And therefore an answer, purporting to be the answer of a minor by his mother and guardian, may be read against the mother, in another cause, where she is defendant in her own capacity (4). The answer of one defendant, generally speaking, is not evidence against a co-defendant (5); for, if that were allowed, a plaintiff might make one of his friends a defendant, for the purpose of procuring an answer in his favour against the co-defendant, who would have no opportunity of cross-examination (*b*). As an admission by one of two partners, concerning joint contracts during the

(1) Lady Dartmouth v. Roberts, 16 East 334.
(2) Ib.
(3) Eccleston v. Petty, Carth. 79. 3 P. Wms. 237. Gilb. Ev. 44.
(4) Beasley v. Magrath, 3 Schoale and Lefroy's Rep. 34.
(5) Wych v. Meal, 3 P. Wms. 311. 12 Ves. jun. 361.

(*a*) Vide *Field & others* v. *Holland & others*, 6 *Cranch* 8. But the plaintiff cannot avail himself of the answer of a defendant who is substantially a plaintiff. *Ibid.*

(*b*) Vide *Petherick* v. *Turner*, cited 1 *Taunt.* 104, 105. *Phœnix* v. *The Assignees of Ingraham*, 5 *Johns. Rep.* 412. 1 *Caines Cas. in Error* 119. But the answer of one defendant is evidence against other defendants claiming through him. *Field & others* v. *Holland & others*, 6 *Cranch* 8.

partnership, is good evidence to charge the other partner, in an action against him alone (6): so, in an action by a creditor against *some of the partnership firm, the answer of another partner to a bill filed by other creditors, has been received in evidence against the defendants, not indeed to prove the partnership, but, that being established, as an admission against those who are as one person with him in interest (1). *267

It does not appear to have been expressly determined, whether an answer by a married woman can be used as evidence against her in an action after the husband's death. In the case of Wrottesley against Bendish and his wife (2), (where it was argued, that the wife was not bound to answer, on the ground that the answer could not be read against her husband, nor against herself, as she is supposed to be under the control of the husband, and not to answer freely), the Lord Chancellor said, "he would not give any opinion, whether the answer may be read against the wife, when discovert; but as, in all times heretofore, the wife as well as the husband had been compelled to answer, he would not overthrow what had been the constant practice (*a*)."

Depositions in a suit in chancery, which are the written examinations of witnesses taken by officers of the court or by commissioners specially appointed for the purpose, may be given in evidence in an action at common law, on the same matter, between the same parties, or between any Depositions.

(6) Wood and Others, Assignees of Hussey and Others, v. Braddock, 1 Taunt. Rep. 104. See ante, p. 73.

(1) Grant v. Jackson and others, Peake N. P. C. 203. See Lucas v. De La Cour, 1 Maule & Selw. 250; also p. 73., supra.

(2) 3 P. Wms. 237.

(*a*) An answer in chancery being an admission of a party, the objection of *res inter alios acta* does not apply to it, as it does to other legal proceedings, and therefore it may be given in evidence in a suit at common law by one who was not party to the suit in equity. *Peake's Ev.* 55. *Grant* v. *Jackson et al. Peake's Cas.* 203. *Kiddie* v. *Debrutz*, 1 *Hayw.* 420.

who claim under them, if it can be proved, at the time of the trial, that the deponent is dead (3); or, that he cannot be found after strict inquiry (4); or, that he has been subpœnaed and is unable to attend from sickness (5); or, if it can be proved, that he has been kept away by the contriv-
* 268 *ance of the other party (1); or, that he is out of the kingdom, or not amenable to the process of the court (2). In either of these cases, depositions are admissible in evidence. But if the witness himself is in a state to be produced, his depositions cannot be received. The party who wishes to have the benefit of his testimony, ought, if he is able, to bring him forward, that he may undergo an open examination, in the face of the public, before the jury and the court: a mode of inquiry, generally more conducive than any other to the discovery of truth (*a*).

When a witness has been examined on interrogatories, and afterwards by accident becomes interested in the thing in question, the court of chancery has allowed his depositions to be read for him, as evidence in his own suit, on a bill of revivor (3). "This," said Lord Hardwicke, "has been allowed on just reason; because his evidence must be taken, as it stood at the time of his examination, which should not be set aside, unless it could be supplied by other evidence (4)." But a different rule has been established in courts of common law. It was resolved in Tilly's

(3) Godb. p. 193. pl. 276. and p. 326. pl. 418. Fry v. Wood, 1 Atk. Rep. 445. Coker v. Farewell, 2 P. Wms. 563. Gilb. Ev. 54. Bull. N. P. 239.

(4) See cases in (3). Benson v. Olive, cor. Reynolds, C. B. 2 Str. 920.

(5) Luttrel v. Reynel and others, 1 Mod. 283. Adm. per cur. in Kinsman v. Crooke, trial at bar, 2 Ld. Ray. 1166. 1 Atk. 445. Gilb. Ev. 54. Bull. N. P. 239. 1 Ves. & Beam. 22. 340.

(1) Bull. N. P. 243.

(2) 1 Atk. Rep. 445. Lord Altham v. Earl of Anglesey, tr. at bar in K. B., Gilb. Eq. Cas. 16. 18.

(3) Goss v. Tracy, 2 Vern. 699. 1 P. Wms. 287. S. C. Haws v. Hand, 2 Atk. 615.

(4) In Glyn v. Bank of England, 2 Ves. 42.

(*a*) A deposition taken in a suit between A. and B. at the instance of the defendant, is not thereby rendered admissible evidence against B. in another suit between B. and C. *Hovey* v. *Hovey*, 9 *Mass. Rep.* 216.

case by the unanimous opinions of the courts of King's Bench and Common Pleas, that a party to an action of ejectment could not give in evidence his own depositions, though he had made them at a time when he was perfectly disinterested (5).

Depositions are not to be admitted in evidence for a party to the suit, against a stranger, who was not a party, nor claims under either of the parties (6); nor can they be *used by a stranger against one of the parties (1) (*a*). An exception has been sometimes made in cases where the question is on the existence of a custom or on the right to tolls, or where hearsay and reputation would be good evidence (2); and it has been said, that in such cases depositions may be admitted, though the parties in the two suits are not the same. But, after the opinions expressed by some of the judges in the Berkeley peerage case, respecting depositions in a question of pedigree, there is reason to doubt, whether such evidence would now be considered admissible (3). * 269

When a bill has been dismissed, the rule respecting the admissibility of the depositions has been laid down with the following distinction. If the bill was dismissed because the court considered the matter to be unfit for equity to decree, the depositions may still be given in evidence, provided the subject-matter of the suit was regularly before the court, and within its jurisdiction (4). But, if the suit in equity be dismissed for the irregularity of the complainant, the depositions in that cause cannot be read in any fresh suit. Thus, where a devisee brings a bill of revivor, on a suit commenced by his devisor, and depositions are

(5) Tilly's case, 1 Salk. 286. See also Holcroft v. Smith, Eq. Cas. Ab. 224; Baker v. Lord Fairfax, 1 Str. 101; Bull. N. P. 242.

(6) Hob. Rep. 155. 2 Roll. Ab. 679. pl. 8. 1 Vern. 413., Coke v. Fountain.

(1) Rushworth v. Countess of Pembroke and Currier, Hardr. 472. Gilb. Ev. 55. See ante, p. 231. 233.

(2) Bull. N. P. 239. See ante, p. 233.

(3) See ante, p. 179, 180. and see Banbury peerage case, ante, p. 263.

(4) Smith v. Veale, 1 Ld. Ray. 735.

(*a*) Vide *ante*, 222.

taken, and then the cause on the hearing is dismissed, because a devisee, claiming as a purchaser and not by representation, cannot bring a bill of revivor, the devisee will not be allowed, on exhibiting a new original bill, to use the former depositions; for, in the first cause, in which the complainant mistook his remedy, there was no complaint regularly before the court, and consequently there could not regularly be any depositions (5). For the same reason, such depositions would not be admitted as evidence, in a fresh suit at law.

*270 *If the witness after being examined de bene esse should die before the defendant puts in his answer, his deposition cannot be read (1), because the opposite party had not the power of cross-examination; and the rule of common law is strict, that no evidence shall be admitted, but what is or might have been under the examination of both parties. "In such a case," says Ch. B. Gilbert (2), "the course is to move the court of chancery, that the deposition of the deceased witness should be read; and, if the court see cause, they will order it, and this order will bind the parties to assent to the reading of such depositions, though it does not bind the court of nisi prius." It is the common practice in the court of Chancery, when an issue or trial at law is directed, to make an order that the depositions of witnesses shall be read in evidence, if it be satisfactorily proved at the time of the trial, that they are unable to attend in person (3). But this order is not made, for the purpose of making that admissible in evidence, which is not strictly admissible in courts of common law, but for the convenience of the parties. For if depositions are offered at the trial without such an order, the whole record, bill, answer, &c. must be proved; but, if there is an

(5) Backhouse v. Middleton and others, Chan. Cas. 175. Gilb. Ev. 56. Smith v. Veale, 1 Ld. Ray. 735.

(1) —— v. Browne, Hardr. 315. Dutton v. Colt, Sir T. Ray. 335. n. Ford v. Guy, cited in Howard v. Tremaine, 1 Show. 363. Piercy v. ——, 2 Jon. 165. Bull. N. P. 240.

(2) Gilb. Ev. 57, 58. Bull. N. P. 240. And see Masden v. Bound, 1 Vern. 331.

(3) Corbet v. Corbet, 1 Ves. and Beam. 340.

order for reading the depositions, the court of law will read them without going through the regular and strict course, which is generally necessary for the purpose of making them evidence (4).

The reason why depositions are not read in evidence, before the defendant has put in his answer, has been before mentioned to be, because it does not otherwise appear that the adverse party had liberty to cross-examine. This reason will not apply, where the defendant is in contempt for refusing to answer. If the adverse party, says Ch. B. Gilbert, had been in contempt, then the depositions of *the witnesses shall be admitted, for then it is the fault of the objector that he did not cross-examine the witnesses, since he would not join the examination (1). * 271

There has been, however, some difference of opinion on this subject. It is said to have been held in one case (2), that if witnesses are examined de bene esse before answer, upon a contempt, such depositions cannot be made use of in any other court, but in that court only, where they are taken. The reason, adds the reporter, seems to be because there was no issue joined, so as there could be a legal examination; and they were only taken to be read in the court in which they were taken, upon a contempt to that particular court. In another case, the case of Howard v. Tremaine (3), which was an action of ejectment by a devisee against an heir at law, a question was reserved for the opinion of the court of King's Bench, whether depositions could be given in evidence for the plaintiff under the following circumstances: a bill having been exhibited in chancery by the plaintiff to perpetuate testimony, the defendant stood in contempt and would not answer; upon which the plaintiff had a commission, and examined witnesses to the matter of his bill de bene esse, and the defendant joined in the commission, and cross-examined some of the witnesses produced for the plaintiff, and, before the

(4) Palmer v. Ld. Aylesbury, 15 Ves. jun. 176.
(1) Gilb. Ev. 56.
(2) Watt's case, Hardr. 331.
(3) 1 Show. 363. 1 Salk. 278. S. C. Carth. 265. S. C.

answer came in, the witnesses died. After an argument on the point, Lord Holt, according to the report in Shower, said, "Quære, if any court by course of law can examine witnesses till issue be joined, and therefore I much doubt, if these depositions can be evidence. We cannot take notice of what the Chancery allows as evidence, and their practice is no rule to us." Dolben, J. also doubted. But Gregory, J. thought the depositions good evidence, as the defendant had joined in the commission, and cross-examined. And Eyre, J., according *to the report in Salkeld, was clearly of opinion, that they ought to be admitted. "It would be very inconvenient," he said, "if such evidence were not allowed. For the heir at law will not answer the plaintiff's bill, and will not call in question the title of the devisee, as long as the devisee has witnesses alive to prove the will; but as soon as they are dead, he will commence his suit." The report in Shower adds, that in consequence of the doubt expressed by Lord Holt, the case was adjourned. But in Carthew's report of the same case, it is stated, that, "after much debate, the court was of the same opinion, that the depositions might be given in evidence; otherwise, a bill in equity to perpetuate the testimony of witnesses would be to very little or no purpose."

*272

This subject came before the court of King's Bench in the late case of Cazenove. v. Vaughan (1); from which it now appears to be clearly settled, that depositions are not allowed to be read in evidence, before answer put in or before the party is in contempt, unless he has had an opportunity of cross-examining; but if he has had such an opportunity, and has omitted to avail himself of it, he cannot afterwards make that a ground for objecting to the depositions as evidence.

(1) 1 Maule & Sel. 4.

Sect. II.

Of Depositions, Examinations, Inquisitions, &c. &c.

Depositions by consent.

Depositions are frequently taken with the consent of the parties to a suit, when a material witness is about to leave the kingdom, or resides abroad (2). And these depositions may be given in evidence, if at the time of the trial the witness has quitted the country (3). But if the trial comes on before his departure, or after his return, *the depositions cannot be read. This rule, however, is not to be taken so strictly, as to make it absolutely necessary, that a witness, who is about to go abroad, should be on his voyage, when the trial comes on. If the ship has sailed, though it may have put back, or if the witness be on board, and the ship ready to sail, though prevented by contrary winds, that seems to be sufficient (1) (*a*).

* 273

(2) See ante, p. 10.
(3) Anon. case, 2 Salk. 691. Falconer v. Hanson, 1 Campb. 172.
(1) Fonsick v. Agar, 6 Esp. N. P. C. 92.

(*a*) In the state of New-York depositions of witnesses may in certain cases be taken *de bene esse* under a judge's order, without the consent of the opposite party; but it is necessary that the party obtaining the order should give notice of the time and place of the examination. The most common ground for examining a witness in this manner is his expected departure from the state, but it will be allowed in the case of a witness who is so aged and infirm as not to be able to attend court. The examination may be taken at any time after the commencement of the suit, even before issue joined. *Concklin* v. *Hart*, 1. *Johns. Cas.* 103. *Mumford* v. *Church*, *Ibid.* 147.

Except in the few instances mentioned in the text, the courts of common law in England do not admit the depositions of witnesses taken in a foreign country, in evidence. But a contrary practice prevails in this country, and the courts of the United States as well as the superior courts of the several states permit a party in a

Depositions in India.

Where an indictment or information is exhibited in the King's Bench for an offence committed in India, or where a suit has been commenced in any court in this country for a cause of action arising in India (2), the depositions of

(2) Francisco v. Gilmore, 1 Bos. & Pull. 177.

---

suit to take the examinations of witnesses, not amenable to the process of the court, to be read in evidence in the cause, certain forms calculated to prevent surprise and the introduction of false or partial testimony, being observed. It is obvious that in a country, the intercourse between the different parts of which is so extensive, under one general government, and yet consisting of so many local, independent jurisdictions, if such a practice were not authorized there would in many cases be a total failure of justice. Yet it is also obvious, that the examination of witnesses otherwise than in open court, is, not only inadequate to the due investigation of truth, but unless exercised with great caution, and placed under every restriction which may tend to prevent one party from gaining an undue advantage over the other, would be productive of greater inconvenience than, without it, could arise from the occasional failure of right through defect of proof; therefore the party at whose instance the examination is taken should give notice of his intention, that his adversary may have an opportunity to introduce a cross examination, or in any other manner protect his rights. However, these cautions, necessary as they may appear to be, have not been universally regarded, and in many of the states depositions taken in the loosest manner are allowed as testimony. Thus, in Connecticut, depositions taken before a justice of the peace in another state, frequently without notice, the necessity of which depends altogether on the proximity of the residence of the parties or their attorneys are admissible, with no other security than that they shall not be *written* by a person interested, or an attorney in his client's cause. *Swift's Ev.* 112, 113. The practice of the courts of the United States, although better guarded, is in some respects similar to that of Connecticut. See Act of Congress of Sept. 24, 1789, s. 30.

The *act for the amendment of the law, Laws of N. Y.* sess. 36. c. 56. s. 11. authorizes courts of record to issue commissions for the examination of witnesses not resident in the state. For this purpose application must be made to the court by motion, supported by affidavit, and after due notice to the opposite attorney: and it

witnesses may be obtained under the provisions of the statute 13 G. 3. c. 63. ss. 40. & 44. This statute enacts, that the Court may award a writ of mandamus to the judges of the courts in India, as the case may require, for the examination of witnesses, who are to be examined publicly in the court upon oath, administered according to the form of their several religions; and these depositions, duly taken and returned, in the form prescribed by the act, are to be allowed and deemed as good and competent

---

is then discretionary with the court to grant or refuse the commission, who appoint the commissioners, being the persons suggested by the respective parties, if not objected to for some valid reason: the name of the witness must be inserted in the commission, and interrogatories must be drawn up in writing, a copy served on the opposite party, who is entitled to propound cross-interrogatories, and if there is any disagreement to the propriety of the questions of either party, the interrogatories are to be settled by the court or a judge, and when approved must be annexed to the commission. A commission will not in general be granted until after issue joined, and is a stay of proceedings for such time as would reasonably be sufficient for the execution and return of the commission. The mode of examining the witnesses and of closing up and returning their examinations are particularly pointed out by the statute and must be strictly observed. Vide *Vandervoort* v. *Columbian Ins. Co.* 3 *Johns. Cas.* 137. *Watson* v. *Delafield*, 2 *Caines' Rep.* 260. *Hackley* v. *Patrick*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 478. *Biays* v. *Merrihew*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 251. *Kirby* v. *Watkies*, 1 *Caines' Rep.* 503. *Coles* v. *Thompson*, *Ibid.* 517. *Bouchereau* v. *Le Guen*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 196.

Where a commission was sent to a foreign country, where the government as a principle refused to let the commissioners act, as being an assumption of sovereign power, but the commission was executed by a judge or court of the country, in presence of the commissioners, the depositions of the witnesses were permitted to be read, as otherwise the course of justice might be impeded, but the court observed they would see that the evidence was fairly taken. *Winthrop* v. *Union Ins. Co.* C. C. U. S. P. 2 *Condy's Marsh.* 706 *n.*

evidence, as if the witness had been sworn at the trial, and examined viva voce.

Depositions before commissioners of bankrupt.

The depositions of witnesses, taken by commissioners of bankrupt, could not formerly be given in evidence, in an action to try the question of bankruptcy or any other question connected with it, because in these proceedings the parties interested had not the power of cross-examining the witnesses (3). But now, by the statute 5 G. 2. c. 30. s. 41. "Upon petition of any person to the great seal, praying that the commission and the depositions taken thereon, or any part of such depositions, and any other matter or thing relating to the commission, or the proceedings thereon, *may be entered of record, the great seal may direct them to be entered of record; and in case of the death of the witnesses proving the bankruptcy, or in case the commission, depositions, proceedings, or other matters or things, be lost or mislaid, a true copy of the record of such commission, depositions, and proceedings, or other matters or things, signed and attested as therein mentioned, may upon all occasions be given in evidence to prove such commission and the bankruptcy of such person, against whom the commission issued, or other matters or things (*a*)."

* 274

These depositions, when recorded, are evidence in an action at law, to prove the precise time when the act of bankruptcy was committed (1); for the witness cannot tell his story before the commissioners, without saying when the act of bankruptcy was committed. He must mention that naturally and of course, and therefore is the more likely to speak the truth. In many cases, its being an act

(3) 2 Roll. Ab. 679. pl. 9. Bull. N. P. 242.

(1) Janson v. Wilson, 1 Doug. 257.

(*a*) Certified copies of the proceedings filed in the District Court, of the commissioners under the late bankrupt law of the U. S. were held *prima facie* evidence, against all persons, of the commission, trading, and act of bankruptcy. *Rugan* v. *West*, 1 *Binney* 263.

of bankruptcy depends on the time. The legislature considered the commissioners as indifferent persons, examining the witnesses with impartiality, and taking care of the interests of all parties (2).

By statute 49 G. 3. c. 121. s. 10., in all actions brought by or against assignees, the commission and the proceedings of the commissioners are to be received as evidence of the petitioning creditor's debt, and of the trading and bankruptcy, unless the other party in the action, if defendant, at or before the time of pleading to the action, and if plaintiff, before issue joined, give notice in writing to such assignee, that he intends to dispute the same. And by section 11. of the same act, in all suits in equity by or against assignees, the commission and proceedings are to be received as evidence of the petitioning creditor's debt, and of the trading and bankruptcy, against all the *other parties in the suit, unless such parties, some or one of them, within ten days after rejoinder in the cause, give notice in writing to the assignees, that they intend to dispute the same. This statute applies only to those cases where the assignees are parties to the action. In an action between third persons, if the validity of a commission of bankruptcy comes incidentally into question, as a ground of defence, it must be regularly proved, as it would have been before the passing of the statute (1.) But the statute is not confined to cases where the assignees are named as such upon the record; and will apply, where the opposite party knows that they make out their title under the commission (2). When the proceedings are offered in evidence, it will be sufficient to prove that they came out of the proper custody, (namely, that of the solicitor to the commission,) or to prove the hand-writing of one of the commissioners, before whom they were taken (3). Such evidence is necessary, although there has

* 275

(2) Per Ld. Mansfield, ib.

(1) Doe dem. Mawson v. Liston, 4 Taunt. 741.

(2) Simmonds v. Knight, 3 Campb. 251.

(3) Collinson v. Hillear, 3 Campb. 30.

not been any notice of an intention to dispute their validity.

The words of the statute are, that "the commission and the proceedings of the commissioners are to be received *as evidence* of, &c., unless the other party give notice in writing, that he intends to dispute the same." The proceedings are therefore *prima facie* evidence; but not conclusive. The bankrupt, in an action against the assignees, may call witnesses to contradict the depositions respecting the petitioning creditor's debt, the trading, or the bankruptcy, although he has not given such a notice to the assignees (4).

In an action of assumpsit for a creditor's share, under an order of commissioners of bankrupt for a dividend, the
* 276 *proceedings of the commissioners are conclusive evidence of the debt, against the bankrupt's assignees (1): where the debt has been once liquidated before the commissioners, it cannot be litigated, except on an application to the great seal. But on an indictment for perjury, charged to have been committed by the defendant in passing his examination before the commissioners, strict evidence of the bankruptcy seems to be necessary, and the commission and proceedings under it will not be sufficient proof; for the authority of the commissioners in taking the examination is grounded, not in the commission, but in the bankruptcy (2).

Depositions before justice of peace.

Justices of the peace are enabled and directed to take the depositions of witnesses in cases of felony, by the statutes 1 & 2 Ph. & M. c. 13. s. 4., and 2 & 3 Ph. & M. c. 10. (3). By the first of these statutes, "justices of the peace, when any person is brought before them for manslaughter or felony, being bailable by law, shall, before any bailment, take the examination of the prisoner, and the examination of them who bring him, of the fact and

(4) Ellis v. Shirley, 3 Campb. 424.
(1) Brown v. Bullen, 1 Doug. 407.
(2) R. v. Punshon, 3 Campb. 96.
(3) 1 Hal. P. C. 305. 585. 2 Hal. P. C. 52. Tong's case, Kel. 19. Paine's case, 1 Salk. 281. Woodcock's case, 2 Leach Cr. Cases 565.

circumstances thereof, and the same, or as much as may be material to prove the felony, shall put in writing, before they make the bailment; which examination, with the bailment, the said justices shall certify at the next general gaol delivery to be holden within the limits of their commission."

As this statute extended only to bailable felonies, and not to cases where the justice committed a prisoner on suspicion of manslaughter or felony, (in which cases, however, the examination of the prisoner, and of those who brought him before the magistrate, was more necessary, than where the prisoner was bailed,) it was therefore enacted by statute 2 & 3 Ph. & M. c. 10., "that the justice, before he shall *commit a prisoner, brought before him on suspicion of manslaughter or felony, shall take the examination of the prisoner, and the information of those who bring him, of the fact and circumstance thereof, and shall put the same, or as much thereof as shall be material to prove the felony, in writing, within two days after the said examination, and the same shall certify in such form and at such time as they ought to do, if such prisoner so committed had been bailed (*a*)." * 277

In the construction of these statutes, it seems now to be settled (1), that the depositions of a witness, taken upon oath (2), in the presence of a prisoner (3) who has been brought before the magistrate on a charge of felony, may be given in evidence on the trial of an indictment for the same felony, if it be proved on oath to the satisfaction of the court, that the informant is dead (4), or not able to

(1) See Hawk. Pl. Cr. b. 2. c. 46. s. 15.

(2) 1 Hal. P. C. 305. 586. 2 Hal. P. C. 52. 120. 284. Dalton. Just. c. 111. p. 369. Bull. N. P. 242.

(3) R. v. Payne, 5 Mod. 163. cited per Ld. Kenyon, 3 T. R. 723. Woodcock's case, 2 Leach Cr. C. 566. R. v. Vipont, 2 Burr. 1163.

(4) 4th res. in Ld. Morley's case, Kel. 55. Bromwich's case, 1 Lev. 180. Dalt. c. 111. p. 369. Adm. per Cur. in Payne's case, 1 Salk. 281. Hal. P. C. ib. Bull. N. P. 242. Case of Flemming and Windham, 2 Leach Cr. C. 996. Westbeer's case, 1 Leach Cr. C. 14. (in which case the depositions were those of a deceased accomplice).

(*a*) Vide Laws N. Y. sess. 36. c. 104. s. 2. 2 R. L. 507. *Dunl. New-York Just.* 100, 101.

travel (5), or that he is kept away by the means and contrivance of the prisoner (6); provided also, that the depositions offered in evidence are proved to be the same as were sworn before the justice, without any alteration (7). Before the statute of Philip and Mary, a deposition taken before a justice of the county where a felony was committed, would not have been evidence, even though the witness had died or was unable to travel (8).

It is not essential to the validity of depositions, that they should be signed by the deceased witness. In Flemming's case, on an indictment for a rape, all the judges concurred
* 278 *in opinion that the depositions of a girl deceased, on whose person the crime had been committed, taken on oath by the committing magistrate, had been properly admitted in evidence at the trial, though the depositions were not signed by the deceased (1).

The information of witnesses, taken before justices of the peace, cannot be given in evidence on an indictment for a misdemeanor, (as, on an information for publishing a libel,) or in civil actions, or on an appeal for murder (2). Nor can a conviction for petty treason be grounded on such evidence (3); for the statute 1 Ed. 6. c. 12. s. 22. enacts, "that no person shall be indicted, arraigned, condemned, or convicted, for any offence of treason or petty treason, unless he be accused by two sufficient and lawful witnesses, or shall willingly without violence confess the same;" and this is confirmed by statute 5 & 6 Ed. 6. c. 11. s. 12., which enacts, "that no person shall be indicted, arraigned, condemned, convicted, or attainted, for any of the treasons specified in the act, or for any other treasons, unless the offender be accused by two lawful accusers; which said accusers at the time of the arraignment of the party accused shall be brought in person before the party so accused, and

(5) 1 Hal. P. C. 305. 586. 2 Hal. P. C. 52. Kel. 55. (the case of depositions before a coroner).

(6) Kel. 55. Foster Disc. p. 337.

(7) 1 Hal. P. C. 305. 2 Hal. P. C. 52. Kel. 55.

(8) 3 T. R. 710. 722.

(1) Case of Flemming and Windham, 2 Leach Cr. C. 996.

(2) R. v. Payne, 1 Ld. Ray. 729.

(3) Foster Disc. 337.

avow and maintain what they have to say against the said party, to prove him guilty of the treasons or offences contained in the bill of indictment laid against the party arraigned; unless the said party arraigned shall willingly without violence confess the same." However, as a prisoner may be convicted of murder, on an indictment for petty treason, the depositions are admissible in evidence to support a conviction of murder, though not sufficient to support a conviction of petty treason (4).

The words of the statute 1 & 2 Ph. & M. c. 13. s. 4., which are also referred to and adopted by st. 2 & 3 Ph. & *M. c. 10., are, "that the justices shall certify the examination taken before them at the next general gaol delivery within the limits of their commission." It often happens that the felon is taken and examined by a magistrate in a county where the offence was not committed; in such a case, the examinations and informations are to be transmitted into the county where the felon is indicted, and may there be read in evidence against him, though the magistrate had not original cognizance of the offence (1). * 279

As informations, when judicially and regularly taken, are evidence against a prisoner, if the informant dies before the trial; so, on the other hand, where the informant himself gives evidence, the informations may be used, on the part of the prisoner, to contradict his testimony. One of the objects of the legislature in passing the statutes, was to enable the judge and jury, before whom the prisoner is tried, to see whether the witnesses at the trial are consistent with the account given by them before the committing magistrate (2). Thus, it was admitted in Lord Stafford's case (3), that the depositions of a witness, taken before a justice of peace, might be read, at the desire of the prisoner, in order to take off the credit of the witness, by showing a variance between the depositions and the evidence given in court viva voce (3).

(4) Radbourne's case, 2 Leach Cr. C. 512. Swan's case, Foster Disc. 106.

(1) Dalt. Just. c. 111. p. 369. 2 Hal. P. C. 285.

(2) See the judgment in Lambe's case, 2 Leach Cr. C. 633.

(3) 3 St. Tr. p. 131. Hawk. Pl. C. b. 2. c. 46. s. 22.

Depositions before a coroner.

The statute 1 & 2 Ph. & M. c. 13. s. 5. enacts, "that every coroner upon an inquisition before him found, whereby any person shall be indicted for murder or manslaughter, or as accessary before the murder, shall put in writing the effect of the evidence given to the jury before him, being material; and shall certify the same evidence, together with the inquisition or indictment before him taken and found, at or before the time of the trial thereof to be had (*a*)."

* 280 *On this statute, it has been resolved unanimously by all the judges, that in case any of the witnesses, who have been examined before the coroner, are dead, or unable to travel, or kept out of the way by the means and contrivance of the prisoner, their depositions may be read on the trial of the prisoner, the coroner first proving, that they are the same which he took upon oath, without any addition or alteration (1). And proof, that the witness has been inquired after and is not to be found, has been thought sufficient to authorize the reading of the depositions (2). The statute requires the coroner "to put in writing the *effect* of the evidence given to the jury before him, being material;" the true meaning of which appears to be, that he should at least take down the plain and obvious meaning of the words spoken by the witnesses, and not merely to state what, in his judgment, was the result of the evidence.

It does not appear from the report of either of the cases above cited, whether the depositions were taken by the coroner in the presence of the prisoner. But it seems to be the prevailing opinion, that they are admissible, though the prisoner may have been absent at the time of taking the inquisition. A book of authority (3), after stating the general rule, that depositions are not evidence, where there

(1) Lord Morley's case, Kel. 55. Thatcher's case, 2 Jon. 53. Bromwich's case, 1 Lev. 180. Gilb. Ev. 124. See ante, p. 277.

(2) Adm. per Cur. in Harrison's case, cor. Holt, C. J., Atkins, J., and Nevil, J., 4 St. Tr. 496. Contra, 4th res. in Ld. Morley's case, Kel. 55.

(3) Bull. N. P. 242.

(*a*) Vide *Laws of New-York*, sess. 24. c. 43. s. 2. 1 R. L. 150.

cannot be a cross-examination, adds, by way of exception, "yet, if the witnesses examined on a coroner's inquest be dead or beyond sea, their depositions may be read; for the coroner is an officer appointed on behalf of the public to make inquiry about the matters within his jurisdiction." And in the case of the King against the Inhabitants of Eriswell (4), (where Mr. Just. Buller, in support of his opinion on the case then before the court, stated that depositions before a coroner had been long settled to be good evidence, though the person accused be not present when they are *taken, nor ever heard of them till the moment, when they are produced against him,) Lord Kenyon, who differed from Mr. Justice Buller on the principal question, said (1), that the case alluded to, was an exception founded on the statute of Philip and Mary. Besides, he added, the examination before the coroner is an inquest of office; it is a transaction of notoriety, to which every person has a right of access; and writs of ad quod damnum have been frequently set aside, for want of this notoriety in the execution of them by the sheriff. To this effect also Lord Hale lays it down (2), that the coroner's inquest must hear evidence on oath as well for the party accused as for the king, if it be offered to them; because the proceeding is not so much an accusation on an indictment, as an inquisition of office to inquire truly, how the party came to his death; and for an omission in this respect, an inquisition of felo de se has been quashed. * 281

Inquisition.

An inquisition of felo de se, taken before the coroner super visum corporis, is considered by Lord Coke (3) to be conclusive evidence of the fact against the executors or administrators of the deceased. But Lord Hale in his Pleas of the Crown (4) is of a different opinion, conceiving it unreasonable that they should be concluded, and lose the goods of the deceased without an answer, by an inquisition,

(4) 3 T. R. 713.
(1) 3 T. R. 722.
(2) 1 Pl. Cr. 415. 2 Pl. Cr. 60. Scorey's case, 1 Leach Cr. C. 50.
(3) 3 Inst. 55.
(4) 1 Pl. Cr. 416. 1 East P. C. 389.

which may be taken by the coroner behind their backs. And it is now settled that such an inquisition may be removed into the King's Bench, and traversed by the executors and administrators of the deceased (5).

If it be found by the coroner's inquisition, in case of the death of a person who is not felo de se, that the person, who committed the offence, fled for it, the authorities hold this finding to be conclusive and not traversable; yet, upon
* 282 *principle, it should seem as if the one case were as much traversable as the other (1).

There are various other kinds of inquisition of office, which, if regularly taken, and under a competent authority, will be admitted by courts of law as evidence of the facts there found. Some inquisitions are taken on an inquiry made by the sheriff, or coroner, or escheater, by virtue of their office, or under a writ directed to them for that purpose: others are taken by commissioners, specially appointed to examine witnesses on oath, and inquire into the several matters specified.

An inquisition of lunacy is evidence on the trial of an indictment, to show that the prisoner was insane when he committed the offence (2). Such inquisitions are evidence even against third persons, who were strangers to the proceeding. Thus, in a case where an inquisition of lunacy was offered as evidence to affect the rights of third persons, and objected against as res inter alios acta, Lord Hardwicke overruled the objection, and said that inquisitions of lunacy, and likewise other inquisitions, as post mortem, &c., are always admitted to be read, but not conclusive (3). So an inquisition taken by virtue of a commission which issued in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, under the seal of the court of Exchequer, to commissioners to inquire, whe-

(5) See 1 Saund. 362. note 1 by the Editor, who has there collected the cases on this subject. As to the duty of the coroner in taking an inquest, see stat. 1 H. 8. c. 8.

(1) See n. (5). ante, 281., and Hawk. b. 2. c. 9. s. 54.

(2) R. v. Bowler, O. B. June 1812, before Le Blanc, J. and the present Ch. J. of the Common Pleas, MS.

(3) Sergeson v. Sealey, 2 Atk. 412. Faulder v. Silk and another, 3 Campb. 126. See Jones v. White, ante, p. 239.

ther a prior was seised of certain lands as parcel of a manor, or whether the crown was seised of them after the dissolution of the priory, was adjudged to be good evidence of those facts (4). And an inquisition, taken under an order of the House of Commons, is evidence respecting the fees of certain offices (5).

*Inquisitions, which are extrajudicial or irregularly taken, will not be received in evidence. Thus an inquisition made by a sheriff's jury, for the purpose of ascertaining who was entitled to the property of goods taken under an execution, is not admissible evidence even against the sheriff, in an action of trover brought by the party in whose favour the inquisition was found (1). This evidence was received at the trial of the cause by Mr. Justice Buller, who admitted it, but held it not to be conclusive; and, a verdict having been found for the defendants, a motion was afterwards made for a new trial, on the ground that the inquisition was conclusive evidence in favour of the plaintiff, as against the person who contested the property with the plaintiff, and who was present at the time of taking the inquisition. But the court refused the application. Ch. J. Eyre, said he doubted whether a sheriff can, strictly speaking, hold any inquisition as to property, except under a writ de propriate probanda in replevin. And Mr. Justice Buller said, he thought he ought not to have admitted the evidence at the trial, as the inquisition was not under the king's writ, but merely a proceeding by the sheriff of his own authority. * 283

In order to make an inquisition evidence, the commission, under which it was taken, ought regularly to be proved, or shown to be lost. But in cases of more general concern, such as the minister's return to the commission in the reign of Hen. 8. for inquiring into the value of livings, a copy of the whole record need not be taken, and

(4) Tooker v. D. of Beaufort, 1 Burr. 146.

(5) Green v. Hewett, Peake N. P. C. 184.

(1) Latkow v. Eamer & Burnett, Sheriff of Middlesex, 2 H. Black. 437.

the commission is of such public notoriety as not to require any proof (2).

Examinations.

The general rule respecting the admissibility of depositions after the death of the witness, is, that they are not evidence, unless they have been taken judicially, and unless *the party, whose interests would be affected by them, had an opportunity of being present and cross-examining the deponent. It is therefore now clearly established, that the ex parte examination of a pauper concerning his settlement, taken on oath before magistrates, is not admissible, upon a question of settlement, as evidence against the appellant parish (1). The objection against their admissibility is not, that the magistrates have no power to administer an oath, (for it seems to be admitted, that the statute 13 & 14 C. 2. c. 12. s. 1., which first gave them a power to remove, gave them also incidentally a power to examine the pauper preparatory to a removal (2),) but, that the examination is ex parte, obtained at the instance of overseers, whose parish would be benefitted by the removal, and behind the backs of the appellants, who received no notice of the proceeding, and had not the benefit of a cross-examination (3).

* 284

There are some exceptions to the general rule, besides those already mentioned, founded on the special provisions of acts of parliament. Thus, the examination of a single woman before a magistrate, under the statute 6 G. 2. c. 31., (which enacts, that, in case any single woman shall, in an examination to be taken in writing upon oath before any justice, &c., charge any person with having gotten her with child, it may be lawful for the justice to issue his warrant for the immediate apprehension of such person, &c.) (*a*), will be evidence after the woman's death against the repu-

(2) Bull. N. P. 228. Hardcastle v. Sclater, 2 Gwill. 767.

(1) R. v. Nuneham Courtenay, 1 East 373. R. v. Ferry Frystone, 2 East 54 R. v. Abergwilly, ib. 63.

(2) Per Ld. Kenyon, R. v. Eriswell, 3 T. R. 721.

(3) Per Ld. Kenyon, R. v. Eriswell, 3 T. R. 725.

(*a*) Vide *Laws N. Y.* Sess. 36. c. 12. s. 2. 1 R. L. 306.

ted father, on his appearance at the sessions to abide the order of the court according to his recognizance. This examination, taken by the directions of the statute, in a judicial proceeding, will be evidence like depositions under the statute of Philip and Mary (4); although the proceeding *before the magistrate is entirely ex parte, and though the party accused is not present at the woman's examination. * 285

The examination of a soldier before a magistrate, touching his settlement, is made evidence on an appeal, by the mutiny act (1), which enables "two or more justices for the county, where any soldier shall be quartered, in case he has either wife or child, to cause him to be summoned before them in the place where he is quartered, in order to make oath of the place of his last legal settlement. And such justices are required to give an attested copy of such affidavit to the person making the same, to be by him delivered to his commanding officer, in order to be produced when required, which attested copy shall be at any time admitted in evidence as to such last legal settlement at any general quarter sessions of the peace." As an attested copy is thus made evidence, it has been determined, on a reasonable and obvious construction of the act, that the original affidavit, which is a higher kind of evidence, ought to be admitted as well as the copy (2). The statute however is to be construed strictly; and therefore no other attested copy is legal evidence, while the original is in existence, except that given to the soldier (3). For the same reason, it should seem, if the soldier, who has been examined before the magistrates, be abroad, or dead, or has quitted the army, at the time when the appeal is tried, the original affidavit or an attested copy would not be admissible in evidence. "One inconvenience, intended to be remedied by the act, was that of taking a soldier out of the quarters, for the purpose of his being examined respecting his settlement; and

(4) R. v. Ravenstone, 5 T. R. 373.
(1) Sect. 33.
(2) R. v. Warley, 6 T. R. 534.
(3) R. v. Clayton-le-Moors; 5 T. R. 706.

in order to guard against this inconvenience, the act directs the magistrates, who take the soldier's examination, to give him a copy of it, to be delivered to the commanding officer; that copy is lodged in the hands of the commanding officer, that it may be afterwards produced when required. But if
* 286 *the soldier go abroad, the same inconvenience is not likely to happen, and the act of parliament does not apply to such a case (1)."

Depositions in ecclesiastical courts.

Depositions taken in an ecclesiastical court, in a cause within its jurisdiction, seem to be admissible in evidence upon the same footing as depositions in the court of Chancery, the parties being the same, and having had an opportunity of cross-examining the deponents. Chief Baron Gilbert lays down the rule thus (2); "Depositions taken in the spiritual court in a cause relating to *lands* cannot be read, because they are no oaths at all, inasmuch as the spiritual courts have no authority to take depositions relating to lands: but it seems they may be read, when taken in a cause in which they have authority, as far as relates to that cause, inasmuch as these are lawful oaths, and a man may be indicted for the violation of them, though they be not oaths in a court of record." It does not appear, in any of the cases above mentioned, to have been thought essential to the admissibility of depositions, that they should be made in courts of record; but the material consideration was, whether they were taken judicially, and whether the other party, against whom they were offered in evidence, had any opportunity of cross-examining the deponent. And upon this principle, Lord Holt, in the case of Breedon v. Gill (3), was of opinion, that depositions before commissioners of excise, (who by statute 12 C. 2. c. 24. s. 45. have a power to administer oaths on inquiring into forfeitures,) taken in the presence of the other party, and signed by the witness, would be admissible on an appeal from the sentence of the commissioners, in case the witness should be dead at the

(1) Per Lawrence, J. in R. v. Clayton-le-Moors, 5 T. R. 708.

(2) Gilb. Ev. 60.

(3) 1 Ld. Ray. 219. 222.

time of hearing the appeal. There are some authorities, which hold, that depositions of witnesses in an ecclesiastical court are not to be admitted in courts of common law (4); *and one book of authority lays it down as a general rule, that depositions, taken in a court not of record, shall not be allowed in evidence elsewhere (1). However, the better opinion seems to be, that such depositions are admissible in evidence, under the limitations above stated. * 287

Judgments of inferior courts.

Judgments in a court baron, county court, or hundred court, and the judgments of any other inferior court recognized by the law of the land (2), are evidence between the same parties, upon the same points in issue, on matters within their jurisdiction. Thus, in an action of debt on a judgment recovered in an inferior court, the judgment will be evidence of the debt, but not conclusive; and the defendant may show that the cause of action was not within the jurisdiction of the court below (3).

Award.

An award, regularly made by an arbitrator, to whom matters in difference are referred, is conclusive, in an action at law, on the parties to the reference, upon all matters within the submission. What has been before said on the subject of judgments by a court of concurrent jurisdiction may be said also of awards, that they are, as a plea, a bar, or, as evidence, conclusive between the same parties, upon the same matter directly in question (4). Thus, in an action of ejectment, where the lessor of the plaintiff and the defendant had before referred to an arbitrator their respective claims to the property in question, the court of King's Bench held, that the party had by his agreement concluded himself from disputing the lessor's title (5). It has been before observed, that an award is not a bar to any cause of

(4) Earl of Sarum v. Sir B. Spencer, 2 Roll. Abr. 679. pl. 5. Lit. Rep. 167. March. Rep. 120.

(1) Bull. N. R. 242. See ante, p. 222.

(2) Com. Dig. "Evidence," C. 1.

(3) Herbert v. Cook, reported in note (a) Willes Rep. 36. See Moses v. Macferlan, ante, p. 225.

(4) See ante, p. 223; and Campbell v. Twemlow, ante, p. 70; and R. v. Cotton, ante, p. 179.

(5) Doe dem. Morris v. Rosser, 3 East 15.

action, which the one party hadagainst the other at the time of the reference, if it appear that the subject-matter
288 * *of the action was not inquired into before the arbitrator (1) (*a*).

The certificate of a vice-consul has been compared to a foreign judgment. But the vice-consul is not, properly speaking, a judicial officer; nor is his certificate to be ad-

(1) Ravee v. Farmer, 4 T. R. 146. ante, p. 235, 6.

(*a*) Vide *ante*, 236. n. (*a*). The rule is now settled in the state of New-York, that an award, although the submission were made a rule of court, cannot be impeached at *common law*, either in a collateral action or an action on the award, for a mistake either of law or fact, and that it can only be avoided, except in chancery, for corruption or partiality in the arbitrators. *Shepherd* v. *Watrous*, 3 *Caines' Rep.* 166. *Newland* v. *Douglas*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 62. *Barlow* v. *Todd*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 367. *Cranston* v. *Ex'rs of Kenny*, 9 *Johns. Rep.* 212. The law appears to be the same in Connecticut. *Bulkley* v. *Stewart*, 1 *Day* 130. *Lewis* v. *Wildman*, *Id.* 153. But it seems that in some of the states an award may be avoided at common law, for a palpable or gross mistake. *Morris & others* v. *Ross*, 2 *Hen. & Mun.* 408. *Cleary* v. *Coor & Hanks*, 1 *Hayw.* 225. *Sumpter* v. *Murrell*, 2 *Bay* 250.

It may not be improper, in this place, to take notice of a mistake which some American Editors have fallen into, respecting the law of the state of New-York in relation to awards. The subject of the awards of arbitrators, and that of the report of referees, have been confounded together: the former of which as before stated, is conclusive; the arbitrators being judges of the parties own choosing, they are bound to abide by their decision; but a reference is a proceeding directed by the court itself in the progress of a cause, by virtue of a particular statute, and the report of the referees, like the verdict of a jury, the place of which it is intended to supply, is subject to the revision and control of the court, and may be set aside either for irregularity or on the merits. A cause referred, but not according to the provisions of the statute, is regarded in the same light as a submission to arbitration. *Miller* v. *Vaughan*, 1 *Johns. Rep.* 315. *Stevenson* v. *Beecker*, *Id.* 492.

mitted as evidence of the fact there stated. In the case of Waldron v. Coombe (2), the court of Common Pleas determined, that the certificate of a British vice-consul in a foreign country could not be received here as evidence of the amount of a sale, although by the law of that country he was constituted general agent for all absent owners of goods, and was authorized and compelled to make the sale in question (*b*).

(2) 3 Taunt. 162.

CHAP. V.

Of the Proof of Records, and judicial Proceedings.

RECORDS are, for security, preserved in public repositories, and, as they cannot be removed from place to place to serve a private purpose, examined copies are admitted as the best producible evidence (3).

Acts of parliaments.

The printed statute-books have been at all times admitted as evidence of public acts of parliament. And by the statute 41 G. 3. c. 90. s. 9., made for the better and more effectual proof of the statute law, it is enacted, that copies of the statutes of Great Britain and Ireland prior to the Union, printed by the printer duly authorized, shall be received as conclusive evidence of the several statutes in the courts of either kingdom.

*A different rule has been adopted with respect to private acts of parliament (*a*). The regular proof of these is * 289

(3) Leighton v. Leighton, 1 Str. 210.

(*b*) Vide post, 301. n.

(*a*) Vide *Proprietors of Kennebeck Purchase* v. *Call*, 1 *Mass. Rep.* 483. In *Duncan* v. *Duboys*, 3 *Johns. Cas.* 125. the general rule is admitted, but the court refused to grant a new trial on the ground that the printed book was admitted in evidence, it being

by an examined copy, compared with the original in the Parliament-office at Westminster. But to prevent the inconvenience of such a strict proof, a special clause is now usually inserted, providing that the act shall be deemed

---

shown that the printed book was correct, by producing an exemplification of the private act. The court say, "Perhaps the reason why the printed statute book is excluded, that the statutes are not considered as already lodged in the minds of the people, does not apply to the case of a private statute given in evidence by the opposite party, against the party for whose benefit the act was passed; for it cannot then be intended as not lodged in his mind, and so cannot operate as a surprise upon him. This exception applies the more strongly in the present case, because the private act admitted on the trial of this cause had been published in a volume, certified to have been collated and compared with the original rolls." The legislature of New-York has since declared, that private acts printed by the Printer of the state may be read in evidence in all cases from the printed statute book. Sess. 36. c. 56. s. 32. 1 R. L. 527. And in Pennsylvania the same rule is established by a decision of the Supreme Court. *Biddis* v. *James*, 6 *Binney* 321. The Supreme Court of the United States has intimated the same opinion. 4 *Cranch* 388. The act of Congress of May 26, 1790, s. 1. 1 L. U. S. 115. has provided that the acts of the legislatures of the several states should be authenticated by having the seal of their respective states affixed thereto. The act of Congress does not require the attestation of any public officer in this case, although in all the cases afterwards provided for, [in the same section in relation to the authentication of records,] such an attestation is required. There is a good reason for the distinction. The seal is in itself the highest test of authenticity; and leaving the evidence upon that alone, precludes all controversy, as to the officer entitled to affix the seal, which is a regulation very different in the different states. By the court, (Washington, J. & Peters, J.) in *the United States* v. *Johns*, 4 *Dall.* 416. It was held, in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in 1789, that a public statute of the state of Virginia, printed by the law Printers of the state, was sufficiently authenticated, so as to be at least prima facie evidence. *Thompson* v. *Musser.* 1 *Dall.* 458. Acc. *Poindexter's Ex'rs* v. *Barker*, 2 *Hayw.* 173.

public; in which case, the copy printed by the king's printer will be sufficient evidence of its contents (1).

Records of courts, and copies of.

Copies of records in courts of justice are of two kinds; under seal, and not under seal. Those under seal are called Exemplifications, and are of higher credit than any sworn copy; for "the courts of justice, that put their seal to the copy, are supposed more capable than a common person to examine, and more exact and critical in their examination (2)." These exemplifications are of two kinds; under the great seal in Chancery, or under the seal of some other court (3).

1. The practice is not to exemplify a record under the great seal, unless it be either a record of the court of Chancery, or be sent from some other court into Chancery, the centre of all courts, by writ of certiorari. But in either of these cases a copy may be obtained, under the attestation of the great seal (4).

If the record of a court is put in issue by a proceeding in the same court, the record itself is inspected by the judges (*b*). But when the record, denied by the issue, is in a court of superior or concurrent jurisdiction, the trial is then by the tenour of the record, which may be obtained by certiorari and mittimus out of Chancery (5), a method adopted for the purpose of communicating evidence of records from one superior court to another, without the inconvenience *of removing the originals. If the record of an inferior court is disputed in a suit before a higher tribunal, the certiorari may be issued out of a superior court, as well as from the court of Chancery (1). And in pursuance of this writ, where the superior court sends for the record of an inferior court, not for the purpose of seeing

*290

(1) See ante, p. 220.
(2) Gilb. Ev. 11, 12.
(3) Gilb. Ev. 12.
(4) 3 Inst. 173. Gilb. Ev. 12. Bull. N. P. 226.
(5) Luttrel v. Lea, Cro. Car. 297. Pitt v. Knight, 1 Saund. 98. Hewson v. Brown, 2 Burr. 1074.
(1) Butcher and Aldworth's case, Cro. Eliz. 821. Guilliam v. Hardy, 1 Ld. Ray. 216.

(*a*) Vide *Burk's Ex'rs* v. *Tregg's Ex'rs*, 2 *Wash.* 215.

whether their proceedings are within the limits of their jurisdiction, but merely to know whether there be in fact such a record, it will be sufficient to certify the tenour (that is, a literal transcript) of the record (2) (*a*). But where the record itself is the subject of the proceedings in the superior court, the original ought to be returned (3).

When records are exemplified, the whole, in general, must be exemplified, for the construction is to be taken from a view of the whole together: and nothing but records can be proved by an exemplification. Private deeds exemplified under the broad seal, will not be admitted in evidence; for as the deeds themselves are in the custody of the party, they ought to be produced, that the court may see, whether there are any erasures or interlineations (4).

2. The second sort of copies under seal are exemplifications of the records of a court under its own seal; and they also are considered to be of higher credit than sworn copies. The seal of the king, and of the public courts of justice, and of all courts established here by act of parliament, are admitted in evidence without extrinsic proof of their genuineness; as, for example, the seal of the county palatine of Chester (5), or of the great sessions of Wales (6), or the seal of the ecclesiastical court on an exemplification of a will (7). But the seals of private courts, or of a fo-
*291 *reign colonial court (1), or of a corporate body (2), ought to be proved by a witness acquainted with their impression. It is not, however, necessary to prove the seal of a corporation in the same manner as the seal of an individual, that is, by producing a witness, who saw the seal affixed to the identical instrument; but when an instrument pur-

(2) Woodcraft v. Kinaston, 2 Atk. 317.
(3) Ib.
(4) Bull. N. P. 227.
(5) Dyer 276. cited per Cur. in Olive v. Gwin, 2 Sid. 146.
(6) Ib. Hardr. 118. S. C. Gilb. Ev. 16.
(7) Kempton dem. Boyfield v. Cross, Rep. temp. Hard. 108.
(1) Henry v. Adey, 3 East 221.
(2) Moises v. Thornton, 8 T. R. 307.

(*a*) Vide *Ladd* v. *Blunt*, 4 *Mass. Rep.* 402.

ports to be under the seal of a corporation, it will be sufficient to show that the seal is the official seal of the corporate body (3).

3. Copies of records, not under seal, are also of two kinds; sworn copies, and office copies.

Records are complete, as soon as they are delivered into court in parchment, and there fixed as the rolls of the court. Of these, a sworn copy will be sufficient evidence for a jury, unless the record itself is in issue. But the copy of a judgment signed by the master is not evidence, though upon such judgment execution may be taken out; for it is not yet become permanent, and is removable from place to place (4).

Copies of records are to be proved as other transcripts, by a witness, who has compared the copy, line for line, with the original, or who has examined the copy, while another person read the original (5) (*a*). But when an ancient record has been lost, a copy may be read without proving it a true copy. Thus an unexamined copy of a

(3) 8 T. R. 303. In Woodmass v. Mason, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 53., it was held by Lord Kenyon, that the seal of the city of London proves itself.

(4) Bull. N. P. 228.

(5) Reid v. Margison, on a rule to show cause in the Exchequer, 1 Campb. 470. Rolf v. Dart, 2 Taunt. 52. M'Niel v. Perchard, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 263., cor. Lord Kenyon. Gyles v. Hill, 1 Campb. 471. n. cor. Lawrence, J.

(*a*) Vide *Lynde* v. *Judd*, 3 *Day* 499. But no copy of that so examined, however authenticated, is admitted; for if the party has the first copy, and by oath or otherwise proves that to be a true copy, then the second is useless, and if only that is produced, then the first not being there to be sworn to, it does not appear that it is a true copy. *Gilbert's Ev.* 9. *Peake's Ev.* 29. 1 *Dall.* 65. Although inferior evidence of the contents of a record, which is shown once to have existed, may be admitted, especially in cases where the record is only inducement to an action, yet the inferior evidence must be above the degree of mere parol proof. *Peake's Ev.* 29, 30. *Thompson* v. *Bullock*, 1 *Bay* 364. S. P. 2 *Hawy.* 76. In some observations in the case last cited Judge Haywood contests the propriety of this doctrine. That a record may be presumed from length of possession, vide *ante*, 119. n.

recovery of lands in ancient demesne has been received, where the original was lost, and where possession had gone for a long time according to the recovery (6). And similar proof has been allowed of the decree in the time of Henry
* 292 *the Eighth for tithe in London, that decree having been lost (1). In such cases, says Ch. B. Gilbert. the instrument must be according to the rule of the civil law, vetustate temporis aut judiciaria cognitione roboratum (2) (*a*).

It is a general rule, that a copy, authenticated by a person appointed for that purpose, is good evidence of the contents of the original, without any proof of its being an examined copy. The chirograph of a fine, for example, is evidence of the fine, the chirographer being appointed to give out copies of the agreements between the parties, which are entered of record (3). So an indorsement by the proper officer on a deed of bargain and sale, enrolled according to the form of the statute 27 H. 8. c. 16., is evidence of the enrolment (4). A rule of court under the hand of the proper officer is itself an original, and may be given in evidence in a legal proceeding in that court, without being proved a true copy (5) (*b*). So, in a case where a witness, being about to leave the country, had been examined at a judge's chambers, a copy of his depositions, delivered out by the clerk of the judge, and attested by the clerk's sig-

(6) Anonym. case, Ventr. 257.
(1) Ventr. 257. Knight v. Dauler, Hardr. 323. Thurston v. Slatford, 1 Salk. 284., per Holt, C. J.
(2) Gilb. Ev. 19.
(3) Gilb. Ev. 21.
(4) Per Buller, J. in Kinnersley v. Orpe, 1 Doug. 56.
(5) Selby v. Harris, 1 Ld. Ray. 745.

(*a*) This species of evidence can be applicable to those cases only, where very ancient records are lost, for if a recent roll be lost, and its contents can be ascertained, the court will permit a fresh one to be engrossed. *Peake's Ev.* 40. 2 *Burr.* 722. 1 *Caines' Rep.* 496.

(*b*) Vide *Jackson d. Wood* v. *Harrow*, 11 *Johns. Rep.* 434. Where one party serves copies of affidavits on another, the originals of which are on file, he cannot afterwards object to the copies being read in evidence by the party on whom they were served, but they are to be considered as equivalent to office copies. *Ibid.*

nature, was admitted in evidence, without proof of its being examined and compared with the original depositions (6). But where the officer of the court is not intrusted to make out a copy, and has no more authority than any common person, the copy must be regularly proved in the strict and regular mode. Thus the office copies of depositions, though they are evidence in the court of Chancery, where officers are intrusted for that purpose, will not be admitted in courts of common law, without examination with the roll (7). So, where a fine is to be proved with proclamations, as it must be to bar a stranger, the proclamations ought to be examined with the roll; *for though the chirographer is authorized to make out copies of the fine itself, he is not appointed to copy the proclamations (1). *293

A verdict will not be admitted in evidence, without also producing a copy of the judgment founded upon it. The production of the postea alone is not sufficient; for it may happen that the judgment was arrested, or a new trial granted (2) (*a*). But this rule will not apply to the case of a verdict on an issue directed out of Chancery, as it is not usual to enter up judgment in such a case; and here, therefore, the decree of the court must be shown, which will be a sufficient proof, that the verdict was satisfactory, and stands in force (3.) And though the nisi prius record, Verdicts.

(6) Duncan v. Scott, 1 Campb. 101.

(7) Gilb. Ev. 21.

(1) Gilb. Ev. 21. Allen's case, Bull. N. P. 229. 3 Taunt 166.

(2) Bull. N. P. 234. Fisher v. Kitchingham, Willes' Rep. 367.

(3) Montgomerie v. Clarke, at the Delegates, 1745, Bull. N. P. 234.

(*a*) Vide *Ridgely & another* v. *Spenser*, 2 *Binney* 70. A verdict in an action before a justice of the peace is evidence without producing the judgment; for the justice is bound to give judgment on the verdict, and can neither arrest it, or grant a new trial. *Felter* v. *Mulliner*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 181. A verdict in a former ejectment is evidence against the defendant, although no judgment has been entered, if he has acquiesced in it, by paying the costs and delivering the possession. *Shaeffer* v. *Kreitzer*, 6 *Binney* 430.

with the postea indorsed, is not evidence of the verdict, it is good and proper evidence that the cause came on to be tried (4) (*b*). In the case, just cited, of Fisher v. Kitchingman, Willes, C. J. doubted whether the associate was the proper person to produce the postea in evidence; because, by several rules of court, it ought to be returned into court to the proper officer within the four first days of the next term; but, on the prothonotaries informing the Court, that scarcely one postea in a hundred was so returned, he was of opinion, that this objection was not of sufficient weight to set aside the verdict.

Writs. When a writ is only inducement to the action, the fact of taking out the writ may be proved without a copy, because possibly the writ might not have been returned, and then it is not a record. But where the writ itself is the gist of the action, there ought to be a copy from the record, as the best proof of which the nature of the case is capable (5) (*c*).

* 294 *If an action of trespass, for taking goods in execution, is

(4) Pitton v. Walter, 1 Str. 161., cor. Pratt, C. J. Fisher v. Kitchingham, Willes' Rep. 368.

(5) Gilb. Ev. 34. Bull. N. P. 234.

(*b*) Where a verdict is recovered against a sheriff for the escape of a prisoner who had given security for the liberties of the gaol, in an action by the sheriff on the bond, the postea without the judgment is evidence to prove the recovery and actual damages, at least, if not the escape. *Kip* v. *Brigham*, 7 *Johns. Rep.* 168. So, in covenant for a breach of the covenant against incumbrances, the postea in an action of ejectment, brought against the grantee by a mortgagee, on a prior mortgage of the same land by the grantor, is evidence of the ejectment suit, and of the fact of a verdict in the cause. *Waldo* v. *Long*, 7 *Johns. Rep.* 173.

(*c*) Vide *Jenner* v. *Joliffe*, 6 *Johns. Rep.* 9. *Brush* v. *Taggart*, 7 *Johns. Rep.* 19. *Foster* v. *Trull*, 12 *Johns. Rep.* 456. *Hasbrouck* v. *Baker*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 248. That the confession of the opposite party will not supersede the necessity of producing a copy, vide *Jenner* v. *Joliffe*, and *Hasbrouck* v. *Baker*, *ubi. sup.*

brought by the party against whom the writ of fieri facias issued, it will be sufficient for the officer to give the writ in evidence, without showing a copy of the judgment (*a*). But if the plaintiff is not the party against whom the writ issued, and claims the goods by a prior execution or sale, the officer, in order to prove the sale or the execution fraudulent, must produce not only the writ, but also a copy of the judgment (*b*). In the first case, he will justify himself, by proving that he took the goods in obedience to a writ issued against the plaintiff; but, in the other case, the goods do not prima facie belong to the party against whom the writ issued, and therefore the officer is not justified by the writ in taking them, unless he can bring the case within the statute 13 Eliz. c. 5. (against fraudulent alienations, &c.) for which purpose it will be necessary to show a judgment (1).

The return of the sheriff upon a writ, which has been duly returned and filed, is *prima facie* evidence of the fact there stated, when that fact comes incidentally into question. If the sheriff return a rescue, the court above, to which the return was made, would give it such credit, as to issue an attachment in the first instance; though, upon an indictment for a rescue, the defendant might show, that the return was false (2). And so, in an action for maliciously suing out an alias fieri facias, after a sufficient execution under the first fieri facias, the Court of King's

(1) Lake v. Billers, 1 Ld. Ray. 733. Martin v. Podger, 2 Black. Rep. 701.

(2) R. v. Elkins, 4 Burr. 2129.

(*a*) Vide *Holmes* v. *Nuncaster*, 12 *Johns. Rep.* 395. In trespass or trover by an officer who has taken goods in execution, against a stranger, the execution, without the judgment, is sufficient evidence of the plaintiff's possession. *Barker & Knapp* v. *Miller*, 6 *Johns. Rep.* 195. *Blackley* v. *Sheldon*, 7 *Johns. Rep.* 32.

(*a*) Vide post, 295. n. *High* v. *Wilson*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 46. *Wilson & Gibbs* v. *Conine*, *Id.* 280. *Harget* v. *Blackshear*, *Tayl.* 107.

Bench held, that the sheriff's return annexed to the writs, (in which he stated, that he had forborne to sell under the first, and had sold under the second writ, by the request, and with the consent of the plaintiff,) had been properly admitted at the trial as evidence of that fact, in support of a plea of license pleaded by the defendant; for, as the Court said, faith ought to be given to the official act of *a public officer, like the sheriff, even where third persons are concerned (1) (*a*).

* 295

Common recoveries.

It is enacted by statute 14 G. 2. c. 20. s. 4., (made for the purpose of protecting purchasers in cases where recoveries have not been entered on record,) that where any person has purchased any estate, whereof a recovery was necessary to be suffered in order to complete the title, such person and all claiming under him, having been in possession of the purchased estate from the time of the purchase, may, after the end of twenty years, produce in evidence the deed making a tenant to the writ of entry, or other writ for suffering a common recovery and declaring the uses, and the deed so produced, (execution thereof being duly proved,) shall in all courts be deemed good and sufficient evidence for the purchaser, and all claiming under him, that the recovery was duly suffered and perfected according to the purport of the deed, in case the record of recovery cannot be found, or should not appear to be regularly entered.

Proceedings in Chancery.

A decree in the court of Chancery may be proved by an exemplification under the seal of the court (*b*); or, by a

(1) Gyfford v. Woodgate, 11 East 297.

(*a*) Although in an action for a false return, the plaintiff may falsify it by evidence; yet the officer making a return, which is, on the return and filing of the writ, a matter of record, cannot be admitted to contradict his own return. *Gardner* v. *Hosmer*, 6 *Johns. Rep.* 325. *Purrington* v. *Loring*, 7 *Mass. Rep.* 388.

(*b*) An exemplification under the seal of the court of Chancery, of a *decretal order awarding execution* on a prior decree, and reciting the substance of a decree of the court for the trial of im-

sworn copy; or, by a decretal order in paper, with proof of the bill and answer (2). But it has been held, that the bill and answer need not be proved, if they are recited in the decretal order (3). And it is said in a book of authority (4), "that, if a party wants to avail himself of the decree only, and not of the answer, the decree, under the seal of the court and enrolled, may be given in evidence, without producing the bill and answer, and the opposite party will be at liberty to show, that the point in issue was not the same as the present issue." However, the rule, generally laid down, seems to be, that, where a party intends to avail *himself of the contents of a decree, and not merely to prove an extrinsic collateral fact, (as, that a decree was made by the court,) he ought regularly to give in evidence the proceedings upon which the decree is founded. "The whole record," says Ch. B. Comyns, "which concerns the matter in question, ought to be produced (1)." So, "a sentence in the admiralty court, may be evidence, upon the libel and answer produced; and a judgment in a court baron, or other inferior court, with proof of the proceedings in which the judgment was given (2)." If, indeed, the fact to be shown were merely, that a decree has been made in the court of Chancery, or that a decree, made there, has been

* 296

(2) Trowel v. Castle, 1 Keb. 21. Com. Dig. Ev. (C. 1.) p. 94.

(3) Per Trevor, C. J. in Wheeler v. Lowth, cited Com. Dig. ib. 1 Keb. 21. contra.

(4) Bull, N. P. 235. citing Ld. Thanet v. Patterson, K. B. East 12 G. 2.

(1) Com. Dig. tit. Evid. (A. 4.) p. 85.

(2) Com. Dig. ib. (C. 1.) p. 94.

---

peachments and the correction of errors, which affirmed the prior decree of the court of Chancery, and ordered it to be carried into execution, was held inadmissible evidence, and that it was requisite to have produced [an exemplification of] the original decree, which was the basis of the execution; and that the execution was inadmissible, as a justification to a vendee in a sale under it without producing the decree warranting it. *Wilson & Gibbs* v. *Conine*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 280.

reversed on appeal, proof of the previous proceedings will not be necessary (3).

An answer cannot be regularly given in evidence without proof of the bill; for without the bill there does not appear to be a cause depending. But if there be proof by the proper officer, that the bill has been searched for in the office and cannot be found, the answer has been allowed to be read without a sight of the bill (4). As the defence in Chancery is upon oath, it will be presumed in ordinary cases, that the answer was sworn to by the defendant. And when an answer is offered in evidence as an admission of the party upon oath, it will be sufficiently proved by an examined copy; nor will it be necessary to show, that there has been any decree in the suit (5). But stricter proof is required on a prosecution for perjury alleged to have been committed by the defendant in his answer. Some evidence of the administration of the oath will there be required; as, that a person, calling himself by the defendant's name, was sworn, and that the signature on the answer (which must be produced) is his hand-writing; or, that the answer is signed by the defendant, and that the jurat, purporting to
* 297 *have been sworn before a master, is attested by the master's hand-writing (1). This strictness of proof is required, not only in criminal proceedings, as on a trial for perjury, but also in actions which are in the nature of a criminal proceeding, as in an action for a malicious prosecution (2).

Depositions. With regard to depositions, the general rule is that they are not to be admitted in evidence without proof of the bill and answer (3); for, if there do not appear to be a cause depending, the depositions are considered to be mere volun-

(3) See Jones v. Randall, Cowp. 17.

(4) Gilb. Ev. 49.

(5) Lady Dartmouth v. Roberts, 16 East 334.

(1) R. v. Morris, 2 Burr. 1189. R v. Benson, 2 Campb. 508.

(2) 16 East 340.

(3) Gilb. Ev. 56. Bull. N. P. 240. Nightingale v. Devisme, 5 Burr. 2594. ad fin. Baker v. Sweet, Bunb. 91. Illingworth v. Leigh, 4 Gwill. 1619. At the trial of the last cited case, Mr. Just. Heath refused to admit depositions in evidence, because the bill and answer had not been duly proved, nor inquired after. But it is said by the reporter, that the rejection of this evidence was one of the grounds upon which a new trial was afterwards granted.

tary affidavits; and the bill and answer ought to be produced, in order to show who were the parties to the suit, and what the points in issue, as depositions are evidence only upon the same points, and between the same parties, or those who claim under the parties. But if the defendant is in contempt, or has had an opportunity of cross-examining, which he chose to forego, the depositions may then be read, after proving the bill, although no answer has been put in (4).

As the practice formerly was not to enrol the bill and answer, ancient depositions may be given in evidence without them (5). And where the court of Chancery, on directing a trial at law, makes an order that the depositions of a witness shall be read, the proof of the bill and answer will be dispensed with. This order is never made for the purpose of making that admissible in evidence, which is not strictly admissible in courts of common law (6); and the depositions cannot be admitted, even under the order, unless it be satisfactorily proved at the time of the trial, that *the witnesses are unable to attend in person. If depositions were offered in evidence without such an order, the whole record, bill, answer, &c. must be regularly proved, but when there is an order for reading depositions, the court of law will read them, without going through the regular and strict course, which is generally necessary for the purpose of making them evidence (1). * 298

The proof of depositions is by an examined copy. Office copies are evidence in the court of Chancery, but not in courts of common law, for a reason before mentioned (2).

Judgments in the House of Lords are not formally drawn up, but minutes only are entered on the journals. The minutes of a judgment are the judgment itself; and they may be proved by an examined copy (3). Judgment in House of Lords.

(4) Cazenove and another v. Vaughan, 1 Maule & Selw. p. 4. See ante, p. 272.
(5) Gilb. Ev. 58.
(6) See ante, p. 270.
(1) Palmer v. Ld. Aylesbury, 15 Ves. jun. 176. Corbett v. Corbett, 1 Ves. & Beam. 340.
(2) See ante, p. 292.
(3) Jones v. Randall, Cowp. 17.

Proceedings in inferior courts.

When the judgment of a court baron, or of any other court of inferior jurisdiction, is offered in evidence, the proceedings on which it is founded ought to be shown (4); but as the record is not usually made up in form, the minutes of their proceedings will be admitted (5), if they are perfect, and omit nothing material.

Probate of wills.

Testaments are proved in the ecclesiastical court, either in common form, or in form of law. The first mode of proof is, where the executor presents the will before the judge, without citing the parties interested, and deposes that it is the true and last will of the testator; upon which, the judge allows the will. The proof in form of law is, when the will is exhibited before the judge in presence of the parties interested, and after a full exmination is finally allowed (6). If the will be proved in common form, it may
*299 *be disputed (*a*) at any time within thirty years; but if it be proved in the more formal mode, and there be no proceedings within the time limited for appeals, the will cannot afterwards be disputed (1). After proof of the will, the original is deposited in the registry of the ordinary or metropolitan, and a copy in parchment is made out under his seal, and delivered to the executor, together with a certificate of its having been proved before him, which copy and certificate are the probate.

It is not the practice in the ecclesiastical courts to grant a second probate if the first should be lost, but only to grant an exemplification from the record of the court, and this exemplification will be evidence of the proof of the will (2). And an examined copy of the probate is evidence of the person there named being executor, as the probate is an original taken by authority, and of a public na-

(4) See ante, p. 296.
(5) Fisher v. Lane, 2 Black. Rep. 334. Per Holt, C. J. in R. v. Hains, Comberb. 337.
(6) 3 Bac. Ab. 40. tit. Executor.
(1) 3 Bac. Ab. 40. tit. Executor.
(2) Shepherd v. Shorthouse, 1. Str. 412. Bull. N. P. 246.

(*a*) Vide *Tayl.* 94. *Hantz* v. *Hull*, 2 *Binney* 511.

ture (3); but a copy of the will would not be evidence of that fact (4).

The probate of a will, devising real property, is not evidence of the contents, in an action of ejectment, even to prove a relationship; for where the original is in being, the copy is not admissible; and, besides, the seal of the court does not prove it a true copy, unless the suit relate only to personal property (5). But the ledger-book, says Mr. Just. Buller, is evidence in such a case, because this is not considered merely as a copy, but is a roll of the court; and though the law does not allow these rolls to prove a devise of lands, yet when the will is only to prove relationship, the rolls of the spiritual court, which has authority to enrol wills, are sufficient proof of such testament. And, under particular circumstances, the ledger-book may be evidence even in a devise of a real estate; as where, in an avowry *for a rent-charge, the avowant could not produce the will under which he claimed, that belonging to the devisee of the land, the ordinary's register of the will, and proof of former payments, were held to be sufficient evidence against the plaintiff, who was devisee of the land charged. However, in such a case, notice ought to be given to the other party to produce the will. It has been often held, that a copy of the ledger-book is not evidence, yet, since the original would be read as a roll of the court without further attestation, it seems fit, says Mr. Justice Buller, that the copy should also be read. The contrary practice, he adds, has been founded upon the mistaken supposition, that the ledger-book is read as a copy, when in fact it is read as a roll of the court (1). *300

To prove that the probate of a will has been revoked, an entry of the revocation in a book of the prerogative court, in which all causes were entered by the register, and which was kept as the only record of such proceedings and of

(3) Hoe v. Nelthorp, 3 Salk. 154; 1 Ld. Raym. 154. S. C. Per Holt, C. J. in R. v. Haynes, Skin. 584. See ante, p. 245.

(4) Bull. N. P. 246.

(5) Ib.

(1) Bull N. P. 246.

the decree of the court, has been admitted to be good evidence (2).

Letters of Administration.

Administration is generally granted by writing under seal. It may also be granted by entry in the registry without letters under seal (3). The ecclesiastical court never grants an exemplification of letters of administration, but only a certificate, that administration was granted; therefore, when a lessee pleads an assignment of a term from an administrator, such certificate is good evidence (4). And the original book of acts, directing letters of administration to be granted, with the surrogate's fiat for the same, is evidence of the title of the party, to whom administration of the intestate's effects is granted, without producing the letters of administration themselves, (notwithstanding subsequent letters of administration granted to another,) if the *first are not recalled; for, the original book was the authority for the proper officer to make out letters of administration, and the letters of administration were only the copy of the original minutes of the court, drawn up in a more formal manner (1). So an examined copy of the act-book, stating that administration was granted to the defendant at such a time, is proof of his being administrator in an action against him, without giving him notice to produce the letters of administration (2).

* 301

Foreign judgment.

In an action upon the judgment of a court of a foreign country, the sentence must be proved by proving the handwriting of the judge of the court, who subscribed it, and the authenticity of the seal affixed. Thus, in a late case (3), the plaintiff, who sued here on a judgment obtained in the island of Grenada, was nonsuited, because, he could not prove the seal affixed to be the seal of the island. And on a motion to set aside the nonsuit, the court said, they could not take official notice, that the seal affixed was the seal of

(2) Ramsbottom's case, 1 Leach Cr. C. 30, n. (*c*).

(3) Vin. Ab. Executor, D. p. 70.

(4) Kempton dem. Boyfield v. Cross. Rep. temp. Hard. 108. Bull. N. P. 246.

(1) Elden v. Keddell, 8 East 187. 16 East 209. Garrett v. Lister, 1 Lev. 25. Bull. N. P. 246.

(2) Davis v. Williams, 13 East 232. Ray v. Clark, ib. 238. n. (*a*).

(3) Henry v. Adey, 3 East 221.

the island, which was necessary to be shown, in order to prove the judgment, which it purported to authenticate; and that proving the judge's hand-writing could not advance the proof of the seal, unless by considering him in the nature of a witness to it, which was not pretended (*a*).

(*a*) Acc. *Delafield* v. *Hand*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 310. It is said by Marshall, Ch. J., 2 *Cranch* 238., that foreign judgments are authenticated, 1. By an exemplification under the great seal. 2. By a copy proved to be a true copy. 3. By the certificate of an officer authorized by law, which certificate must itself be properly authenticated. These are the usual, and appear to be the most proper, if not the only modes of verifying foreign judgments. If they be all beyond the reach of the party, other testimony, inferior in its nature, might be received.

On a motion for a new trial, on the ground of newly discovered evidence, the testimony to be introduced was a copy of proceedings and condemnation at Para, which had been transmitted to Lisbon, from whence the copy was obtained, and purported to come through the secretary of state for foreign affairs of the kingdom of Portugal. Thompson, J. delivering the opinion of the court says:—"If it be, as has been contended, a regulation of the government of Portugal, that all judgments and decrees rendered at Para, are transmitted to Lisbon and registered in the department of state; that regulation should have been shown in some authentic way, and the document in question would then appear to come through the proper channel, and if duly authenticated, might be competent prima facie evidence of what it contains. But nothing appears to show that such is the regulation of the mother country with her colony. This document cannot be considered an exemplification of a judgment. *That* should be under the great seal; this is only under the seal of arms of the secretary of state: neither is it a sworn copy of the original, and it cannot be received as an office copy, it not appearing that the secretary of state has officially the custody of records of this description. The translation of this document from the Portuguese into the English language, ought to have been made on oath; interpreters are always sworn. The translation of a consul, not on oath, can have no greater validity, than that of any other respectable man." *Vandervoort & another* v. *Smith*, 2 *Caines' Rep.* 155.

Award.

The effect of an award has been before mentioned (4). In an action upon an award, it will be necessary to prove both the submission and the execution of the award. And, in general, (whether the validity of the award comes into

(4) See ante, p. 179. 287.

In a case in the Supreme Court of the U. S. a copy of a decree made at Para, certified in the same manner by the secretary of state at Lisbon was held inadmissible. Marshall, Ch. J.—"If it be true that the decrees of the colonies are transmitted to the seat of government, and registered in the department of state, a certificate of that fact under the great seal, with a copy of the decree authenticated in the same manner, would be sufficient prima facie evidence of the verity of what was so certified; but the certificate offered to the court is under the private seal of the person giving it, which cannot be known to this court, and of consequence can authenticate nothing.—Admitting the originals in the Portuguese language to have been authenticated properly, yet there was error in admitting the translation to have been read on the certificate of the consul. Interpreters are always sworn, and the translation of a consul, not on oath, can have no greater validity than that of any other respectable man." *Church* v. *Hubbart*, 2 *Cranch* 187. Copies of proceedings in the vice admiralty court of Jamaica, certified under the seal of the court by the deputy registrar, who was certified by the judge of the court, who was certified by a notary public, were held admissible in evidence without proof of the seal and the hand-writing of the judge: Marshall, Ch. J.—"The sentence in this case is sufficiently authenticated to be received as evidence. Being a court acting under the law of nations, its proceedings may be proved according to the mode observed in the present case; and were this doubtful, that doubt would be removed by the circumstance that it is the form stipulated by treaty." *Yeaton* v. *Fry*, 5 *Cranch* 335. Where a sentence of a foreign prize court was authenticated by a copy under the seal of the court, signed by the actuary in the absence of the register, though not signed by the judge, and such seal and signature were proved by the deposition of a witness, it was held sufficient. *Gardere* v. *Columbian Ins. Compy*, 7 *Johns. Rep.* 514. In an action of assumpsit on a foreign judgment a witness swore, that he applied to the reputed clerk of the court for the copy of the record of the

question directly, or only incidentally,) the submission of all the parties ought to be regularly proved. Thus, where there had been a deed of reference, between a creditor and several partners, of all copartnership accounts and of all

---

judgment, that he assisted the clerk in comparing the copy with the record, and in affixing the seal of the court to the copy, and saw the same clerk attest the copy by putting his name to it. The verification of the record was held sufficient. *Buttrick & Wife* v. *Allen*, 8 *Mass. Rep.* 273. In an action on a judgment in a court in the island of St. Vincent, the plaintiff's counsel produced a document signed by the chief justice of the island, but without a seal; and Ld. Ellenborough refused to receive it in evidence, without satisfactory proof that the court had no seal, for until that was proved, it would be presumed that the court had a seal. *Alves* v. *Bunbury*, 4 *Campb.* 28. Proceedings in St. Domingo, during a short period, in which the possession of the island had passed from France to England, were, from the particular circumstances of the case, held sufficiently authenticated by the private seal of the governor. *Hadfield* v. *Jameson*, 2 *Mun.* 53. Though the courts of one country cannot judicially take notice of the seal of a foreign court, yet the public seal of a state stands on a different footing; it is matter of notoriety, and may be taken notice of by another as part of the law of nations, acknowledged by all. *Anon.* 9 *Mod.* 66. *Peake's Ev.* 73. *n.* (*q*).

The method of proving the laws of a foreign country seems to be naturally connected with the subject of the text and of the preceding part of this note, and a few observations upon it may not be improper. The courts of one country cannot judicially take notice of the laws of other countries, and therefore, where a contract is to be construed according to the laws of the country in which it was made, witnesses are examined to prove what those laws are. 1 *P. Wms.* 431. *Peake's Ev.* 73. *n.* (*q*). *Peake's Cas.* 18. Et vide *Walpole* v. *Ewen*, 2 *Marsh.* 762. But there is a material distinction between the written and unwritten law of a foreign country; the latter only can be proved by parol: the former must be proved by a duly authenticated copy of the statute itself. *Livingston & Gilchrist* v. *Maryland Ins. Compy*, 6 *Cranch* 274. *Kenny* v. *Clarkson & Van Horne*, 1 *Johns. Rep.* 385. *Hulle* v. *Heightman*, 4 *Esp. Rep.* 75. 3 *Esp. Rep.* (*Day's Ed.*)

matters in difference between the parties or any two of
* 302 *them, and an action of trover was afterwards brought by the creditor, the assignee under a commission of bankruptcy of one of the partners, (in which action the plaintiff pro-

---

60. n. (2.) . *Robinson* v. *Clifford*, C. C. U. S. P. *Condy's Marsh.* 706. *n.* *Millar* v. *Heinrick*, 4 *Campb.* 155. A witness being offered to prove that the exportation of specie from the Spanish colonies was a prohibited trade, the court rejected the evidence, saying it was a commercial regulation of the government, and a subject of pure municipal regulation, not of common law. The law itself should be produced, or evidence given that efforts had been made to obtain a certified copy, which had failed, in which case inferior evidence might be received. *Seton* v. *Del. Ins. Co.* C. C. U. S. P. *Condy's Marsh.* 706. *a.* In *Church* v *Hubbart*, ubi sup. two edicts of the king of Portugal, certified by the American consul at Lisbon under his official seal, to be copies from the original law of the realm, were given in evidence in the court below, but were held inadmissible by the Sup. Court of the U. S. Marshall, Ch. J. says —" Foreign laws are well understood to be facts which must, like other facts, be proved to exist before they can be received in a court of justice. The principle that the best testimony shall be required which the nature of the thing admits of; or, in other words, that no testimony shall be received which presupposes better testimony attainable by the party who offers it, applies to foreign laws as it does to all other facts. The sanction of an oath is required for their establishment, unless they can be verified by some other such high authority that the law respects it not less than the oath of an individual. In this case the edicts produced are not verified by an oath. The consul has not sworn; he has only certified that they are truly copied from the originals. To give to this certificate the force of testimony, it is necessary to show that this is one of those consular functions to which, to use its own language, the laws of this country attach full faith and credit. Consuls, it is said, are officers known to the law of nations and are intrusted with high powers. This is very true, but they do not appear to be intrusted with the power of authenticating the laws of foreign nations. They are not the keepers of those laws. They can grant no official copies of them. There appears no reason for assigning to their certificate respecting a foreign law, any higher or different degree of credit than would be assigned to their certifi-

duced the award and deed of reference, as evidence of a separate debt due to him from the bankrupt,) the court of King's Bench held, that it was indispensably necessary to prove the execution of the deed by all the parties; for this

---

cates of any other fact. It is very truly stated, that to require, respecting laws or other transactions in foreign countries, that species of testimony which their institutions and usages do not admit of, would be unjust and unreasonable. The court will never require such testimony. In this, as in all other cases, no testimony will be required which is shown to be unattainable. But no civilized nation will be presumed to refuse those acts for authenticating instruments which are usual, and which are deemed necessary for the purposes of justice. It cannot be presumed that an application to authenticate an edict by the seal of the nation would be rejected, unless the fact should appear to the court. Nor can it be presumed that any difficulty exists in obtaining a copy. Indeed, in this very case the very testimony offered would contradict such a presumption. The paper offered to the court is certified to be a copy compared with the original. It is impossible to suppose that this copy might not have been authenticated by the oath of the consul as well as by his certificate. It is asked in what manner this oath should itself have been authenticated, and it is supposed that the consular seal must ultimately have been resorted to for this purpose. But no such necessity exists. Commissions are always granted for taking testimony abroad, and the commissioners have authority to administer oaths, and to certify the depositions by them taken." Marine ordinances of foreign countries, promulgated by the executive, by order of the legislature of the United States, may be read in the courts of the United States, without further authentication or proof. *Talbot* v. *Seaman*, 1 *Cranch* 1. The admission of a party that he had infringed the revenue laws of a foreign country, whereby the plaintiff had sustained damage, for which he stipulated to indemnify the plaintiff, will supersede the necessity of further evidence of those laws. *Smith* v. *Elder*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 105. As to evidence of the acts of state of a foreign government, vide 1 *Campb.* 65. n. (*a*).

The manner in which the acts of the legislatures of the several states are to be authenticated has been already stated: vide ante, 289. n. The same section of the act of congress directs, that

was a reference of the aggregate accounts between all and each of the partners, and the consideration to each for entering into the submission was, that each party's a count should be liquidated, not only as to one, but as to all; the accession of all therefore ought to be proved; and, without such proof, the arbitrator would not appear to have competent authority to decide the whole question between the parties (1).

(1) Antram v. Chace, 15 East 209.

CHAP. VI.

On Public Writings, not judicial.

The next species of evidence, which our subject leads us to consider, relates to such public writings as are not ju-

---

"the record and judicial proceedings of the courts of any state, shall be proved or admitted in any other court within the United States, by the attestation of the clerk, and the seal of the court annexed, if there be a seal, together with a certificate of the judge, chief justice, or presiding magistrate, as the case may be, that the said attestation is in due form. And the said records and judicial proceedings authenticated as aforesaid, shall have such faith and credit given to them in every court within the United States, as they have by law or usage in the courts of the state from whence the said records are or shall be taken." 1 Laws U. S. 115. s. 1. Of the effect, in evidence, of a record thus authenticated, see supra, p. 254. n. A record, the attestation of which was not certified *to be in due form*, was held not to be sufficiently proved. *Smith* v. *Blagge*, 1 *Johns. Cas.* 238. Where there is no seal, it should be certified that there was none. 1 *Hayw.* 395. *n.* In *Ellemore* v. *Mills*, 1 *Hayw.* 359., it was held that the act of congress was only affirmative and did not abolish such modes of authentication as were used before it passed. A record of a court of the U. S. is not within the act of congress, and it was held, that a record of the Circuit Court of the United States for the district of Massachusetts, under the seal of the court, but certified by the clerk as a copy, this being the ordinary mode used in Massachusetts, was sufficient. *Pepoon* v. *Jenkins*, 2 *Johns. Cas.* 119.

dicial. In treating of this part of the subject, it will only be necessary to mention some of the principal documents of this description; after which, we shall proceed to inquire, how a party, who wishes to use public writings in evidence, may obtain an inspection.

Doomsday-book.

The most ancient public document in the kingdom is Doomsday-book, consisting of two volumes, kept in the receipt of the Exchequer. They contain a general survey of all the counties in England, excepting the four northern, and were compiled soon after the Conquest, for the purpose of ascertaining the ancient demesne lands, which were the socage tenures first in the hands of Edward the Confessor, *and afterwards of William the Conqueror. This has been always considered a book of the greatest authority; and if a question should at any time arise, whether a manor is ancient demesne, the trial is by inspection of Doomsday-book (1). These volumes have of late years been printed at the expense of government, in consequence of an address from the House of Lords; and the work is said to be executed with the most scrupulous fidelity and correctness (2). Another ancient survey, which ascertains the extent of the king's ports, is also deposited in the Exchequer (3). These surveys are recognized and treated as authentic documents in courts of justice, having been made by the authority and order of the government of the country, on public occasions, and on subjects of public interest.

* 303

Surveys of ecclesiastical benefices.

The Valor Beneficiorum, or Pope Nicholas's Taxation, is another document of a public nature, and of great authority. In the year 1288, Pope Nicholas the Fourth, to whose predecessors in the see of Rome the first fruits and tenths of all ecclesiastical benefices had for a long time been paid, granted the tenths to King Edward the First for six years, towards defraying the expense of an expedition to the Holy Land; and, that they might be collected to their full value, a taxation by the king's precept was begun in

(1) Hob. 188. Gilb. Ev. 69.
(2) First report of H. of Commons, on Public Records. Appx. A. 1. a.
(3) Gilb. Ev. 69.

that year, and finished for the province of Canterbury in the year 1291, or the 20th year of the reign of Edward the First; and for that of York in the following year; the whole being under the direction of the Bishops of Winton and Lincoln (4). This taxation of Pope Nicholas is a most important document, because all the taxes, as well those paid to our kings as those to the pope, were regulated by it, till the survey made in the twenty-sixth year of Henry VIII.; and because the statutes of colleges, which were
* 304 founded before the Reformation, are also interpreted *by this criterion, according to which their benefices, under a certain value, are exempted from the restriction in the statute of the twenty-first of Henry VIII. concerning pluralities (1). The original is kept in the office of the king's remembrancer in the Exchequer.

A new Valor Beneficiorum was instituted in the twenty-sixth year of Henry VIII., when the first fruits and tenths of every ecclesiastical promotion were annexed to the revenue of the crown (2). To ascertain their value, ecclesiastical surveys were taken, by virtue of commissions in the king's name, issuing under the great seal (3); and these surveys are evidence of their amount at that period. Upon the same principle, surveys of the possessions of religious houses, previous to the dissolution of the monasteries, are received in evidence (4); and these surveys are admissible, although the commissions, under which they were taken, are not to be found (5).

Surveys of the church and crown lands were taken by commissioners in the time of the commonwealth, under the authority of acts or ordinances of the parliament; and copies of these surveys were deposited in many of the cathedrals. The originals would have been good evidence of the particulars of the surveyed estates, upon the same principle as

(4) See First Report of H. of Commons on Public Records, p. 15.

(1) Humphreys v. Knight, Cro. Car. 455. 2 Lutw. 1305. Stump v. Ayliffe, 2 Gwill. 536.

(2) St. 26 H. 8. c. 3.

(3) Sect. 3 & 10.

(4) Vicar of Kellington v. Trin. Coll. Cambridge, 1 Wils. 170.

(5) See (4), and Bagshaw v. Bp. of Bangor, cited in Underhill v. Durham, 2 Gwill. 542.

the other public surveys which have been before mentioned; but as they were destroyed at the time of the great fire in London, the copies have been admitted, as evidence, in the place of the original surveys, provided they have been kept in unsuspected repositories (6). The parliamentary surveys have the credit of being taken with extreme accuracy and minuteness. The circumstance, therefore, of *these surveys being silent as to a supposed modus has been considered to be strong evidence against its existence (1). * 305

Journals of parliament.

The Journals of the Lords or Commons are evidence of their proceedings. Thus, an entry in the Journals of the House of Lords, stating that a judgment below has been reversed, is evidence of the fact of reversal (2); and the Journals have been admitted to prove an address from the House of Lords to the King, and the answer of the King (3). But a resolution of either House is not evidence of the truth of facts there affirmed; and therefore in the case of Titus Oates, who was charged with having committed perjury on the trial of persons suspected of the popish plot, a resolution of parliament, asserting the existence of the plot, was not allowed to be evidence of that fact (4) (*a*).

Gazettes.

The public acts of government, and acts by the king in his political capacity, are commonly announced in the Gazette, published by the authority of the crown; and of such acts announced to the public in the Gazette, the Gazette is admitted in courts of justice to be good evidence. Proclamations for a public peace, or for the performance

(6) Underhill v. Durham, 2 Gwill. 542.

(1) 11 East 284. 1 Maule & Selw. 294.

(2) Jones v. Randall, Cowp. 17.

(3) Franklin's case, 9 State Tr. 259., cited by Buller, J. 5 T. R. 445.

(4) 4 State Tr. 39.

(*a*) A printed copy of public documents, transmitted to congress by the president of the United States, and printed by the printer to congress, is evidence. Per Kent, Ch. J. *Radcliff* v. *United Ins. Co.* 7 *Johns. Rep.* 38. (In this case a printed copy of a letter from the British secretary of state to the American ambassador, was offered as evidence of the existence of a blockade.)

of quarantine, and any acts done by or to the king in his regal character, may be proved in this manner (5); and, upon the same principle, articles of war, purporting to be printed by the king's printer, are allowed to be evidence of such articles (6). In the last reported case on this subject, a Gazette, in which it was stated, that certain addresses had been presented to the king, was adjudged by the court of King's Bench to be proper evidence, to prove an averment of that fact in an information for a libel (7); for they are addresses, said Lord Kenyon, of different bodies of the king's subjects, received by the king in his public
* 398 capacity, *and they thus become acts of state. Gazettes are not evidence of private titles or private interests, as of a presentation, or of a grant by the king to an individual, which have no reference to the affairs of government; nor is a Gazette evidence to prove an appointment to a commission in the army (1). The Gazette is not evidence, as public notice of a particular fact, more than any other newspaper; unless it is made such by act of parliament, as in the case of bankrupts. An advertisement, therefore, announcing a dissolution of partnership, would not of itself be evidence of that fact, so as to discharge one of the partners from debts subsequently contracted by the rest with a partnership-dealer; but there ought to be some further proof, as, that the dissolution was notorious in the neighbourhood. It is incumbent on persons dissolving a partnership, to send notice of such dissolution to all the persons with whom they had dealings in partnership (2). However, with respect to such as had not any previous dealings with the partnership, such an advertisement is of itself, without any additional proof, evidence for the jury, upon which

(5) 5 T. R. 436. 443.
(6) R. v. Withers, cited by Buller, J. 5 T. R. 446.
(7) R. v. Holt, 5 T. R. 436.
(1) Kirwan v. Cockburn, 5 Esp. N. P. C. 233. R. v. Gardner, 2 Campb. 513.
(2) Graham v. Hope, Peake N. P. C. 154.

they are to determine, whether it is probable that the dealer knew of the dissolution (3) (*a*).

Parish registers are evidence of births, marriages, and burials. The keeping of registers, for entries of births and christenings, commenced in the thirtieth year of the reign of Henry VIII., and was afterwards enforced by injunctions from Edward VI., and from Elizabeth (4); and the marriage act (5), after directing registers to be kept as public books in every parish, for the purpose of registering marriages, enacts, that "immediately after the celebration of every marriage, an entry thereof shall be made in such register; in which entry or register it shall be expressed, that the marriage was celebrated by banns or license; and *if both or either of the parties married by license be under age, with consent of the parents or guardians, as the case shall be; and shall be signed by the minister with his proper addition, and also by the parties married, and attested by two credible witnesses." By the canons of 1603 (1), copies of parish registers in every diocese ought to be regularly transmitted once in every year to the diocesan or his chancellor; a regulation extremely important for the purpose of guarding the evidences of title and pedigree, but which has been so generally neglected, as to make it necessary for the legislature to interpose, and pass an act for their better preservation. It is by this statute enacted (2), that copies of the register books, verified by the officiating minister of the parish, shall be transmitted annually by the churchwardens, after they or one of them shall have signed the same, to the registrars of the diocese within which the church is situated.

Parish registers.

* 307

(3) Godfrey v. Macauley, Peake N. P. C. 155. n. 1 Esp. N. P. C. 371. S. C. Gorham v. Thompson, Peake N. P. C. 42.

(4) 3 Burn. Eccl. L. 275. Gilb. Ev. 68.

(5) St. 26 G. 2. c. 33. s. 14.

(1) Can. 70. Gibson's Codex, p. 204.

(2) Stat. 52 G. 3. c. 146. s. 7.

(*a*) Vide *Lansing* v. *Gaine & Ten Eyck*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 300 *Mowatt* v. *Howland & others*, 3 *Day* 353.

An entry of marriage in the parish register, made in the form prescribed by the act of parliament, is evidence that the persons therein named were married, on the day specified, by banns, or license, as the case may be. Such an entry is not essential to the validity of a marriage; so that if it has not been expressed in the regular form, the only consequence will be, that it cannot be admitted as evidence of the marriage, which must, therefore, be established by some other medium of proof. In order to prove that the parties described in the register are the same parties whose marriage is in question, it must obviously be unnecessary to call either of the subscribing witnesses to the register; any evidence which satisfies the jury concerning their identity, must be sufficient; as, by proof of the similarity of their hand-writing, or that the bell-ringers were paid by them for ringing after the marriage, or by proof of other circumstances to ascertain the persons (3).

* 308 Registers of ships.

*Public registers are required by act of parliament to be kept for the registering of ships (1); and the register and certificate of register are conclusive evidence of want of title, against those who are not named in the register. Thus, in an action on a policy of insurance on freight, where the interest in a ship and its earnings were alleged to be in four persons, who were partners in trade, two only of whom were named as owners in the register, it was decided that the action could not be maintained, although it was proved as a fact, that the ship had been paid for by all the four partners: for as the plaintiffs claimed the freight only in right of ownership, they could not recover without proving that right; and it appeared conclusively from the register, that all the four partners had not a legal title to the ship (2). But although the documentary evidence furnished by the register-acts is in many cases the strongest proof of title, it is not the only evidence that may be produced. Thus in an action on a policy of insurance effected

(3) Bull. N. P. 27.
(1) Stat. 26 G. 3. c. 60. 34 G. 3. c. 68.
(2) Camden v. Anderson, 5 T. R. Stat. 709.

upon a ship, where it became a question, whether an allegation, of the property being in two persons, could be sustained upon the evidence given in the cause (3), Lord Ellenborough, in delivering the opinion of the court, said, "As to the first point made in this case on the part of the defendant, namely, that the ownership alleged was not sufficiently proved, it was proved by the captain in the ordinary way, that the owners, by whom, as such, he was appointed and employed, were the persons in whom the ownership is by the declaration averred to be. And though it afterwards appeared by his answers on cross-examination, that the ownership was derived to those persons under a bill of sale, executed by himself, as attorney to the former owner, it did not on that account become necessary for the plaintiffs to produce that bill of sale, or the ship's register, or to give any further proof of such their property; the *mere fact of their possession as owners, being sufficient prima facie evidence of ownership, without the aid of any documentary proof of title-deeds on the subject, until such further evidence should be rendered necessary in support of the prima facie case of ownership which they made, in consequence of the adduction of some contrary proof on the other side. No such contrary proof was, however, in this case given on the part of the defendant." * 309

The register of a ship, then, is conclusive evidence, that persons, who are not there named as owners, cannot legally be joint-owners; but the converse of the rule is not true, namely, that all persons, who are named as owners in the register, are liable as such. Such registers are not recognised as public documents to prove the ownership; and they are not evidence to fix the parties therein named as owners, in actions against them, unless they are shown to have been made by their assent or recognised by them. This point was decided in the case of Tinkler v. Walpole (1); which was an action for goods sold and delivered

(3) Robertson and Thompson v. French, 4 East 130. 136. South and others, 4 Taunt. 802. Smith v. Fuge, 3 Campb. 456.

(1) 14 East 226. Cooper v. Fraser v. Hopkins, 2 Taunt. 5.

for the use of a ship, against the defendant as one of the owners. At the trial of the cause, in order to prove the ownership of the defendant, two registers were offered in evidence, purporting to have been made on the oaths of the managing owner, who gave the order for the goods, and of two other part-owners, swearing that they and others named, including the defendant, were owners of the ship; and it was insisted that these registers, on account of their authenticity as public documents, required for public purposes, and obtained under the sanction of an oath, ought to be considered at least prima facie evidence to prove the defendant a part owner. But Lord Ellenborough, C. J. who tried the cause, ruled that the evidence was not admissible, unless it could be shown that the defendant had assented to the register, or at least had
*310 *recognised it. And this opinion was afterwards confirmed by the other judges of the court. On showing cause against a rule nisi for a new trial, Lord Ellenborough expressed himself in the following terms: "Notwithstanding the practice may have prevailed for a long time to receive ships' registers, as evidence of the property being in the persons therein named, yet when we are brought to consider the admissibility of such evidence against the defendant, in a case, where he has done no act to adopt the register, as having been made by his authority, we cannot give effect to it, without saying that a party may have a burdensome charge thrown upon him by the act of a third person, without his own assent or privity. If it had appeared, that the defendant, by any act of his own, had recognised the register, he would have been liable to all the consequences as a part owner, which it describes him to be; but here he has done no act to adopt it. His partner has indeed dealt with the property, as if the defendant were a part-owner, by registering the ship in his name; but the act of a third person, without some act of the defendant to recognise it, cannot throw upon him a burden, without violating the plain rule of law." Mr. Justice Bayley said: "Before the first register act passed,

there must have been other media of proof to charge a party as owner of a ship; and the object of that act was not to create evidence to charge any person named as owner, but that no person should have the benefit of the British navigation, without registering his ship in the manner prescribed. It would be very unjust, in many cases, if a person could be charged, as a part-owner, with the expenses of the ship, by having his name inserted in the register without his knowledge; it would often be converted into an engine of fraud; for if the owners were not in good circumstances, it would be easy to introduce another name of a solvent man into the register, in order to procure credit; and then, if that were evidence against him, he would be liable to be sued; and how could he be prepared to negative the evidence, if he knew nothing of the fact of such a *register? The other owners named would be made parties to the action, so that he could not call them to disprove the fact (*a*)." * 311

Upon the same principle, a register is not of itself evidence of a joint-ownership, in support of the defendant's plea, that other persons there named are jointly liable with him (1); nor is it evidence, that the ship is British-built, as there described (2). So, in an action brought by the plaintiff as agent, on a policy of insurance, the register is not evidence to prove an averment, that the interest in the ship is in the persons there described (3). The legislature

(1) Flower v. Young, 3 Campb. 240.

(2) Reussee v. Meyers, 3 Campb. 475.

(3) Piric v. Anderson, 4 Taunt. 652.

(*a*) In *Woods* v. *Counter et al.* 1 *Dall.* 141. the register of a ship obtained on an affidavit made by one of the defendants, stating that the ship belonged jointly to him and other persons, being copied from the books of the naval officer, and certified under his seal of office, was allowed to be read in evidence against the defendants. It does not appear, from the report, what was intended to be proved by this evidence; probably the joint ownership of the defendants.

has made the registration necessary to complete a title, but this does not make it, of itself, proof of the title. Property in a ship is to be proved now, as it was proved before the acts of parliament relating to registers; as for example, by proving actual possession in the party, or in those to whom he has committed it, or in those from whom he has himself derived his title. Any one of these media of proof, (accompanied by the evidence of the registry, in order to make the other evidence admissible,) will be sufficient (4) (*b*).

Rate-books. It is enacted by st. 17 G. 2. c. 38. s. 14. that true copies of all rates and assessments, made for the relief of the poor, be entered in a book to be provided for that purpose by the churchwardens and overseers of the poor of every parish, &c. who shall take care that such copies be entered accordingly, within fourteen days after all appeals from such rates are determined, and shall attest the same by putting their names thereto; and every such book shall be carefully preserved by the churchwarden, &c. for the time being, or one of them, in some public place, in every such parish, &c. whereto all persons assessed or liable to be assessed may freely resort, and shall be delivered over from time to time to the new and succeeding church-

(4) Ib. p. 657.

(*b*) On the trial of an indictment for the felonious destruction of a ship at sea, a copy of the manifest of the outward cargo of the vessel, certified under the hands and seals of the custom-house officers at Baltimore, was offered in evidence after proof by the witness, that he had himself compared it with the record. The prisoner's counsel objected, that there was no evidence that the original manifest was subscribed by the prisoner or even delivered by him. The district attorney answered, that by the 21st section of the impost law, (4 *vol.* 311, 312.) it was made the duty of the collector of the port, "to record in books to be kept for that purpose, all manifests;" and that being a record, the proof offered was unexceptionable. The court held that the evidence was admissible. *The United States* v. *Johns*, 4 *Dall.* 415.

*wardens, &c. as soon as they enter into their offices, and shall be produced by them at the general or quarter sessions, when any appeal is to be heard or determined.

Book for parish indentures.

The statute 42 G. 3. c. 46. enacts, that the overseers of the poor of every parish, shall provide and keep a book at the expense of the parish, and enter therein the name of every child who shall be bound out by them respectively as an apprentice, together with the several other particulars, in the manner and form required by this act; and every such entry shall be produced and laid before the two justices of the peace, who shall signify their assent to the indenture of apprenticeship, at the time when such indenture shall be laid before them for that purpose, and each entry shall, if approved of, be signed by them according to the prescribed form. And in the third section, it is enacted that any person may at all seasonable hours inspect such book in the hands of the said overseer, and take a copy of such entry; and every such book shall be deemed to be sufficient evidence in all courts of law in proof of the existence of such indentures, and also of the several particulars specified in the register respecting such indentures, in case it shall be proved to the satisfaction of the court, that the indentures are lost or destroyed.

Books in public offices, &c.

The register of the navy office has been admitted in evidence, to prove the death of a sailor (1); the book from the master's office in the Court of King's Bench, to prove a person one of the attorneys of that court (2); and the log-book of a man of war, which convoyed a fleet, to prove the time of the convoy's sailing (3). Bank-books are good evidence to prove the transfer of stock (4); and on a prosecution for a libel published concerning a person in his *office of treasurer of a parish, an entry in a vestry-book, * 313
stating that he was elected at a vestry duly held in pur-

(1) Bull. N. P. 249. Rhodes's case, 1 Leach Cr. C. 29. Wallace v. Cook, 5 Esp. N. P. C. 117. See Barber v. Holmes, 3 Esp. N. P. C. 190.

(2) R. v. Crossley, 2 Esp. N. P. C. 526.

(3) D'Israeli v. Jowett, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 427.

(4) Breton v. Cope, Peake N. P. C. 30. Marsh v. Colnet, 2 Esp. N. P. C. 665.

suance of notice, has been considered sufficient evidence to support an allegation in the indictment, that he was duly elected treasurer (1). So, in an action for disturbing the use of a pew in a church, an old entry in the vestry-book, stating that the pew had been repaired by the then owner of a messuage (under whom the plaintiff claimed,) has been admitted as evidence of his right; being made by the churchwardens on a subject within the scope of their official authority, and as showing the reputation in the parish respecting the right (2). Upon the same principle, the day-book of a public prison, containing a narrative of the transactions of the prison, has been received as proof of the time of a prisoner's commitment or discharge (3): but it would not be admissible to prove the cause of his commitment (4). The distinction between these cases is, that, in the former there was no document besides the one produced, and no other evidence of the fact in question could be given, except perhaps the parol testimony of some person, who might have happened to be in prison at the time; but in the last case, the committitur, from which the entry was inserted in the book, might have been produced, and that would have been better evidence of the cause of commitment.

In the above-cited case of the King v. Aickles, the clerk of the papers of the prison produced a daily book, kept by him, containing entries of the names of all the debtors and criminals brought into prison, and of the times when they were discharged; but it appeared that these entries were not made by the clerk on his own knowledge of the facts, but generally from the information of the turnkeys, and
* 314 frequently from the turnkey's indorsements on the *backs of the warrants, which warrants were afterwards regularly filed. Upon this, it was objected that the entries in the book were mere copies, and that the original minutes, from

(1) R. v. Martin, 2 Campb. 100.
(2) Price v. Littlewood, 3 Campb. 288.
(3) R. v. Aickles, 1 Leach Cr. C. 436.
(4) Salter and others v. Thomas, 3 Bos. & Pull. 188.

which the entry of the prisoner's discharge had been made, ought to be produced as the best evidence. But the court overruled the objection, and admitted the contents of the book, as it appeared to have been the constant and established practice of the keepers of public prisons to register the discharge of prisoners in such books as the one produced, and in the manner there described.

In another case, a parish register of christenings was received in evidence as an original authentic book, although the constant practice in the parish was to make a memorandum of the christenings in a day-book, from which entries were some time afterwards made into the register (1). The question in that case was on the plaintiff's legitimacy, and on the part of the plaintiff a general parish register was produced, in which there was an entry of his christening, describing him in the same manner as legitimate children were usually entered. It appeared that the practice was to make the entries in this register once in three weeks, out of a day-book, in which entries were made immediately after the christening, or the same morning; and in the case of illegitimate children, to insert in the entry the letters B. B., which were intended to signify "base born." The counsel for the defendant then offered in evidence the day-book, from which the other entry was posted, and in which the letters B. B. were inserted, insisting that it was the original entry. But a majority of the judges present, on a trial at bar, were of opinion, that such evidence ought not to be received, on the ground, that there could not be two registers in the parish, and that the one first produced ought to be taken to be the true register.—If, indeed, the entry in the day-book, representing the plaintiff as illegitimate, had been signed by *the reputed father or the mother, or made under their direction, such evidence would have been admissible as the declaration of a deceased parent on a question of legitimacy; but if, on the other hand, in the absence of such proof, the entry appeared to be merely a private memorandum

* 215

(1) May v. May, 2 Str. 1072.

kept for the purpose of assisting the clerk to make up the register, (and of that nature it seems here to have been considered.) in that case it could not be received as the original anthenticated entry.

Rolls of manor courts.

The rolls of a court baron, (which is the court of the freeholders,) or of the customary court, (which is the copyholders' court,) are evidence between the lord of the manor and his copyholders or tenants. They are the public documents by which the inheritance of every tenant is preserved, and the records of the manor court, which was anciently a court of justice relating to all property within the manor (1). So ancient writings, not properly court rolls, but found among the court rolls, and delivered down from steward to steward, purporting to be made "assensu omnium tenentium," have been admitted as evidence to prove the course of descent within a manor; and this, although they were not signed by any of the tenants (2). And an entry in the court rolls, stating the several customs within the manor as found by the homage, and regulating the descent of the several species of tenure, was in another case (3) admitted to be good evidence of the mode of descent, although no instances were shown of any tenant having in fact so taken under the custom. "It cannot be doubted," said Lord Kenyon, "that this evidence was admissible, for tradition and the received opinion are the lex loci. Here was full proof of a tradition respecting the custom of descent in this manor; it was the solemn opinion of twenty-four homagers, who are the constitutional judges
*316 of the court, delivered on an occasion when *they were discussing the interests of all the tenants of the manor."

Upon the same principle, in an action by a copyholder against a freeholder of a manor for surcharging the common (1), an old writing, found among the muniments of the manor, and purporting to be signed by many of the

(1) Gilb. Ev. 67. 4 T. R. 670.
(2) Denn dem. Goodwin v. Spray, 1 T. R. 466. 473.
(3) Roe dem. Beebee v. Parker, 5 T. R. 26. Roe dem. Bennet v. Jeffery, 2 Maule & Selw. 92.
(1) Chapman v. Cowlan, 13 East 10.

copyholders, stating that the commoners of the manor had an ancient unlimited right of common, but that they had agreed to a certain stint, was held admissible evidence of the reputation of the manor at that time, as to the general prescriptive right of common, against the limited right insisted on by the plaintiff; and although it was not proved that the instrument had been signed by a majority of the copyholders, or that the plaintiff held the copyhold tenement under any one of those who had signed, yet that circumstance could not affect the admissibility of the instrument, which was offered in evidence, not on the footing of an agreement, but as evidence of tradition and the received opinion within the manor.

Terriers.

Terriers are of two kinds, temporal and ecclesiastical. It has been established by a variety of cases, that old terriers or surveys of a manor are evidence of manorial tenures or boundaries (2). And so, an ecclesiastical terrier is evidence of the possessions of a church, if it has been regularly made and preserved in the proper repository. By the ecclesiastical canons, an inquiry is directed to be made, from time to time, of the temporal rights of the clergyman in every parish, and to be returned into the registry of the bishop. This return, which is generally signed by the minister, is denominated a terrier, and derives its authority from being found either in the bishop's register office (3), or the registry of the archdeacon of the diocese (4). Unless it comes from one of these repositories, it cannot, in general be admitted *in evidence. A paper therefore, purporting to be a terrier, found in the charter-chest of a college, which had property in the parish, was thought to be inadmissible to disprove a modus (1). However, under particular circumstances, this rule has been relaxed, and a terrier has been admitted, though not brought from one of the regular repositories, where the custody in another

* 317

(2) Gilb. Ev. 69.
(3) Atkins v. Hatton, 4 Gwill. 1406. 2 Anstr. 386. S. C. 4 Gwill. 1593.
(4) Potts v. Durant, 4 Gwill. 1450, 4.
(1) 4 Gwill. 1406.

place has been satisfactorily explained. Thus a terrier, found in the registry of the dean and chapter of Lichfield, was admitted to be evidence against one of the prebendaries (2). This evidence was rejected at the trial; but a new trial was afterwards granted by the court of King's Bench, on the ground, that the evidence ought to have been received, as there appeared to be a proper connexion between the terriers and the place where it was found; and a strong corroborating circumstance was, that the terrier was found annexed to an old lease of the prebend, of nearly the same date (3). But when the custody is merely private and unconnected with the subject-matter, the courts have never gone the length of admitting such papers in evidence. An instrument, therefore, purporting to be an endowment without the seal of the bishop, and another, purporting to be an Inspeximus of the former under his seal, were rejected, because they came out of the hands of a private person, entirely unconnected with the matters contained in them (4). For the same reason, before ancient grants can be admitted as evidence of private rights, the custody in which they have been kept, ought to be satisfactorily explained. In a late case, a grant to an abbey, contained in a manuscript entitled "Secretum Abbatis," in the Bodleian library at Oxford, was rejected, as not coming from the proper custody (5); and, on the authority of this case, Mr. Justice Lawrence held, that an old grant to a priory, brought from the Cottonian manuscripts in the British Museum, could not be received, as it
* 318 was not shown that the possession of *the grant was connected with any person who had an interest in the estate (1).

A terrier is strong evidence against a parson; but it is never admitted for him, unless it be signed by a churchwarden, or, (if the churchwardens are nominated by him,)

(2) Miller v. Foster, 4 Gwill. 1406. n.
(3) 4 Gwill. 1453.
(4) Potts v. Durant, 4 Gwill. 1450.
(5) Mitchell v. Rabbets, cited 3 Taunt. 91.
(1) Swinnerton v. Marquis of Stafford, 3 Taunt. 91.

by some of the substantial inhabitants of the parish (2). Terriers are generally signed by the minister of the parish; but this does not appear to be essentially necessary. In a late case (3), on a bill filed by a vicar against the impropriatrix of a rectory, for agistment tithe, a terrier was given in evidence on the part of the vicar, signed only by the churchwardens; it was objected, first, that it was not a terrier, because made by the churchwardens alone, and not signed by the vicar; secondly, that even supposing it to be a proper terrier, yet that it could not be admitted in evidence in that cause against the rector, as it was not signed by any person claiming under, or on the part of the rector. However, the court were of opinion, that the terrier was admissible; that such imperfect terriers were now uniformly received; that the terrier in question was signed by persons who were in no respect interested, and whose duty it was, from their official situation to sign it; and that the want of the vicar's signature made it stronger evidence in favour of his successor.

Herald's books.

The ancient books of the herald's office (4), and their visitation-books of counties (5), are evidence on a question of pedigree. The visitation-books contain the pedigrees and arms of the nobility of the kingdom from the twenty-first year of Henry VIII. to the latter end of the seventeenth century, during which period the two provincial kings of arms, soon after their investiture in office, usually received a commission under the great seal, authorizing *them to visit the several counties within their respective provinces, "to take survey and view of all manner of arms, cognizances, crests, and other like devices, with the notes of the descents, pedigrees, and marriages of all the nobility and gentry therein contained; and also to reprove, control, and make infamous by proclamation, all such as unlawfully and without just authority usurp or take any

* 319

(2) Bull. N. P. 248.

(3) Illingworth v. Leigh, 4 Gwill. 1615.

(4) King dem. Lord Thanet v. Foster, 2 Jon. 224.

(5) Pitton v. Walter, 1 Str. 161. Matthews v. Port, Comb. 63.

name or title of honour or dignity." The first of these commissions was issued in the twenty-first year of Henry VIII., and the last in the second of James II. (1) From these visitation-books, entries were afterwards made into the books kept at the College of Heralds.

Pope's bull.

A license from the Pope, granted in the reign of Edward the Second, has been adjudged to be evidence of an impropriation, the Pope being formerly the supreme head of the church, and having the disposition of all spiritual benefices (2). For the same reason, a Pope's bull was formerly admitted in evidence, to show that monastery lands had a special exemption from the payment of tithes (3).

Corporation-books.

Corporation-books, containing an account of the privileges or public transactions of the body, are evidence in a suit between the several members, on the same footing as manor-books between the tenants of a manor. But they are not evidence in favour of a corporation to support a claim of right against a stranger (4) (*a*); and before they can be admitted in any case, it ought to be shown that they have been regularly kept by the proper officer of the corporation. On an information in the nature of a quo warranto, the prosecutor produced in evidence a book written by the prosecutor's clerk, not an officer of the corporation, which appeared to be only minutes of corporate acts done some years before, and was not kept as a public book
* 320 of the corporation; *this evidence was rejected at the trial, and, on a motion afterwards for a new trial, the court held that it had been properly rejected. "Corporation-books," the court said, "are generally allowed to be given in evi-

(1) See First Report of the House of Commons on the Public Records, p. 32. Appendix, (c. 8.)

(2) Cope v. Bedford, Palm. 427.

(3) Lord Clanricard's case, Palm. 37.

(4) 1 H. Black. 214. n. (*c*.) Mayor of London v. Mayor of Lynn.

(*a*) So, they are not evidence in favour of a person claiming under the corporation. *Jackson d. Donnally & others*, v. *Walsh*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 226.

dence, when they have been publicly kept as such, and when the entries have been made by the proper officer; not but that entries made by other persons may be good, if it be shown that the town-clerk is sick, or refuses to attend (1) (*a*)."

Histories.

A general history may be admitted, says Mr. Just. Buller, to prove a matter relating to the kingdom at large (2). Thus, in the case of St. Katherine's Hospital, Lord Hale allowed Speed's Chronicles to be evidence of a particular point of history in the time of Edward III. (3). And the same book was admitted as evidence of the death of Edward the Second's queen, in the case of Lord Brounker v. Sir R. Atkins (4), where Ch. J. Pemberton said, he knew not what better proof they could have. Histories, however, it is admitted, cannot be received as proof of a private right or particular custom (5). Camden's Britannia was therefore rejected on an issue, whether by the custom of Droitwich salt-pits could be sunk in any part of the town, or only in a certain place (6). And in another case where the question was, whether a particular abbey was of the inferior order, Dugdale's Monasticon was refused, because the original records might be had in the augmentation-office (7). So, it has been determined, that Dugdale's Baronage is not evidence to prove a descent (8).

Proof of entry in public books.

With regard to the proof of entries in public books, it is now clearly settled, that wherever an original is of a public nature and admissible in evidence, an examined copy

(1) R. v. Mothersell, 1 Str. 92. 12. Vin. Abr. Evidence, (A. b. 15.) pl. 16.
(2) Bull. N. P. 248.
(3) 1 Ventr. 151. Stainer v. Burgesses of Droitwich, 1 Salk. 282. Skin. 623. S. C.
(4) Skin. 14.
(5) Bull. N. P. 248. Cockman v. Mather, 1 Barnard. 14.
(6) 1 Salk. 282. Skin. 623.
(7) Ib.
(8) Piercy's case, 2 Jon. 164.

(*a*) Acc. *Highland Turnpike Company* v. *M'Kean*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 154; in which case it was held that it was not enough to prove the book to be in the hand-writing of a person stated in the book itself, to be the secretary; but not otherwise shown to be the proper officer.

*will equally be admitted (1). The rule is necessary, as well for the security of the instrument, as for the convenience of the public. Examined copies, therefore, of entries in the Journals of the Lords or Commons (2), or of entries in the Bank books (3), or in the books of the East India Company (4), and examined copies of entries in parish registers, or in the books of assessments made by the commissioners of land tax (5), or in the books of the commissioners of excise (6), or in the court rolls of a manor (7), and in other cases of the same kind, have been admitted in evidence, when the original books themselves would have been admissible (*a*). But where an original is of a private nature, a copy will not be evidence, unless the original is lost, or destroyed, or in the possession of the opposite party. Thus, the copy of an old letter, brought from the chest of a corporation, has been refused (8). In one case, indeed, where the original was kept in the Bodleian library at Oxford, and by the statutes of the university not removable, an examined copy was allowed to be given in evidence (9); the court admitted the case not to be within the general rules of evidence, but, under the particular circumstances, permitted the copy to be read (*b*).

(1) Per Holt, C. J. in Lynch v. Clerke, 3 Salk. 153. R. v. Haines, Comberb. 337. Skin. 583. S. C.

(2) Jones v. Randal, Cowp. 17. R. v. Ld. G. Gordon, 2 Doug. 593.

(3) Marsh v. Colnet, 2 Esp. N. P. C. 665. Breton v. Coape, Peake N. P. C. 30.

(4) 2 Doug. 593. n. (3).

(5) R. v. King and others, 2 T. R. 234.

(6) Carth. 346. R. v. Commissioners of Land-tax, 2 T. R. 234.

(7) Tucky v. Flower, Comberb. 137. R. v. Haines, ib. 337., per Holt, C. J. Doe dem. Churchwardens of Croydon v. Cook, 5 Esp. N. P. C. 221.

(8) R. v. Gwyn, 1 Str. 401.

(9) Downes v. Moreman, 2 Gwill. 659. Bunb. 189. S. C.

(*a*) Vide ante, 311. in notis. A copy of an entry in a book kept by a corporation, is not authenticated by the seal of the corporation; an examined copy must be produced. *Stoever* v. *Lessee of Whitman*, 6 *Binney* 416.

(*b*) It may not be improper, in this place, to take notice of a species of writings, which fall more strictly under the division of *public writings, not judicial*, than under any other head, that is,

*CHAP. VII.

On the Inspection of Public Writings.

THE judicial records of the king's courts are safely kept for the public convenience, that any subject may have access to them for his necessary use and benefit; which was the ancient law of England, and is so declared by an act of Records.

---

the official acts of public notaries. Although there may be cases in which the certificate of a notary will be admitted for the purpose of authenticating the judgment of a foreign prize court; (Vide ante, 301. n.) yet his certificate is, in general, evidence for no purpose whatever, except in relation to foreign bills of exchange; in respect of which the non-payment or non-acceptance by the drawee can be proved by no other evidence than the protest; which protest proves itself without further evidence. *Peake's Ev.* 74. n. 221. *Chitty on Bills*, 290. But where an action was brought in England on a foreign bill of exchange drawn upon a person residing in that country, it was held that a protest was not evidence, and that the presentment should be proved in the same manner as if it were an inland bill, or promissory note. *Chesmer* v. *Noyes*, 4 *Campb.* 129.

Nor in an action on a policy of insurance, or in any other case, is the master's protest evidence to prove the loss or other point in issue; but it is admissible to contradict the evidence which the captain who made it may have given at the trial. And its being shown by the insurance broker to an underwriter, as containing an account of the loss for which the insured claimed, will not make it evidence even against the insured whose broker thus produced it. *Christian* v. *Coombe*, 2 *Esp. Rep.* 490. *Senat* v. *Porter*, 7 *Term Rep.* 158. *Marsh. on Insurance*, 716. *Scriba* v. *Ins. Co. N. A. C. C. U. S. P. Condy's Marsh.* 716. *a. Hempstead* v. *Bird*, 1 *Day* 91. *Miller* v. *Ireland*, *Tayl.* 308. *Marine Ins. Co. of Alexandria* v. *Stras*, 1 *Mun.* 408. *Lamalore* v. *Caze*, and *Winthrop* v. *Union Ins. Co.* C. C. U. S. P. *Condy's*

Copy of indictment.

parliament in the forty-sixth year of Edward the Third (1). Some restriction, however, of the general right of inspecting records has been thought necessary in the case of an acquittal on a prosecution for felony; in which case, if the trial is at the Old Bailey, a copy of the indictment cannot regularly be obtained without an order from the court; and it is a common practice, on the circuits, to apply to the court for a copy at the time of the trial. This practice appears to have been first adopted at the Old Bailey, in pursuance of an order made by some of the judges, for the regulation of those sessions in the twenty-sixth year of Charles II. (2). It was then ordered, "that no copies of any indictment for felony be given without special order, upon motion made in open court, at the general gaol delivery; for the late frequency of actions against prosecutors, (which cannot be without copies of the indictment,) deterreth people from prosecuting for the king upon just occasions." And Lord Holt has laid it down as a general rule of law, that if a person be indicted for felony and acquitted, and means to bring an action (without sufficient cause), the judge will not permit him to have a copy of the record, and he cannot

(1) 3 Inst. 71. Pref. to 3d Rep., p. 3, 4.

(2) Directions for Justices at the Old Bailey, prefixed to Kelyng's Rep. p. 3., order 7. See Brangam's case, 1 Leach Cr. C. 32. In this case, Willes, C. J. is reported to have said, that, by the laws of the realm, every prisoner upon his acquittal has an undoubted right and title to a copy of the record, for any use which he may think fit to make of it; and that, after a demand, the proper officer might be punished for refusing to make out a copy.

Marsh. 716. n. A protest may be read in evidence for the purpose of showing a compliance with the clause of the policy, providing that payment shall be made within thirty days after proof of loss: it is a proper preliminary proof, though not evidence at the trial. *Lenox* v. *United Ins. Co.* 3 *Johns. Cas.* 224. *Ruan* v. *Gardner*, C. C. U. S. P. *Condy's Marsh.* 716. *a.* In Pennsylvania and South Carolina, however, the master's protest is evidence in chief. *Nixen* v. *Long*, 1 *Dall.* 6. *Story* v. *Strettel*, *Id.* 10. *Morgan* v. *Ins. Co. of North America*, 4 *Dall.* 456. *Brown* v. *Girard*, 1 *Binney* 40. *Campbell* v. *Williamson*, 2 *Bay* 237.

have a copy without leave (3). In the case of Vander-
*comb and Abbot (1), the prisoners after their acquittal, * 323
applied for copies of the several indictments, for the purpose of assisting them in their plea of autrefois acquit: the court, however, refused to grant them copies, but ordered the officer to read over the indictments slowly and distinctly, which was accordingly done (*a*).

The rule of the judges states, that an action against a prosecutor cannot be maintained without a copy of the indictment, and that a copy is not to be given without an order from the court; but it is not to be inferred from this, that an order is essentially necessary for the introduction of a copy in evidence, or, if a copy were offered to be produced without an order, that it could on that account be properly rejected. The admissibility of such evidence has been determined in the late case of Legatt v. Tollervey (2). On the part of the plaintiff, in that case, the clerk of the court of quarter sessions, before which the indictment had been tried, produced a copy, which, for want of an order, was not allowed to be read; and the plaintiff was in consequence nonsuited. But the Court of King's Bench were of opinion that the evidence ought to have been received, and set aside the nonsuit. "It is very clear," said Lord Ellenborough, C. J., "that it is the duty of the officer, charged with the custody of the records of the court, not to produce a record but upon competent authority, which at the Old Bailey is obtained upon application to the court, pursuant to the order that has long prevailed there; and, with respect to the general records of the realm, upon ap-

(3) In the case of Dr. Groenvelt v. Dr. Burwell and others, 1 Ld. Raym. 253.

(1) 2 Leach Cr. C. 821.

(2) 14 East 302.

(*a*) In order to obtain a copy of the indictment, a certificate of the judge, before whom the indictment was tried, is necessary; and this certificate should state, not merely that the acquittal was satisfactory, but that he thinks a copy *ought to be granted. The People* v. *Poyllon*, 2 *Caines' Rep.* 202.

plication to the Attorney-General. But if the officer, even without authority, shall have given a copy of a record, or produce the original, and that is properly proved in evidence, I cannot say that such evidence shall not be received. He may incur the penalty of his contempt of the court, and may be warned, at the time, of his peril in so doing, and a discreet officer placed in such a situation would, be-
* 324 fore he *produced the record, or gave a copy of it, apply to the court, and state the circumstances; and it cannot be doubted, that he would be saved harmless in doing, what, after such disclosure, the court should order him to do. But still I cannot help thinking, that the rule laid down by Lord Ch. J. Lee, in the case of Jordan v. Lewis (1), is the correct rule. The order made at the Old Bailey was there read by way of objection to the evidence offered, but the Chief Justice, in that case, said, that he could not refuse to let the plaintiff read the copy of the indictment, though obtained without any order of the court for that purpose.

The rule, which has been before mentioned, is confined to cases of felony. In prosecutions for misdemeanors, the defendant is still entitled to a copy of the record, as a matter of right, without a previous application to the court (2). So, in the case of a conviction by a magistrate, the defendant is entitled to a copy of the conviction, in order to defend himself against an action for the same offence; and if it should be refused, and the defendant in consequence sue out a writ of certiorari, merely for the purpose of procuring a copy and making his defence, the magistrate will be compelled to pay his own costs of returning the conviction (3). The conviction may be drawn up at any time, before the return to the certiorari or to the sessions, though after a commitment (4), or after the levy-

(1) 2 Stra. 1122. 14 East 305. n. (a), S. C., reported from Mr. Ford's MS.

(2) Morrison v. Kelly, 1 Black. Rep. 385. Evans v. Philips, reported from MS. in Selw. Ni. Pri. 952.

(3) R. v. Midlam, 3 Burr. 1721.

(4) Massey v. Johnson, 12 East 67. 82.

ing of the penalty (5). And the conviction returned to the sessions, or to the court of King's Bench, is the only one, of which those courts will take judicial notice (6).

A defendant on a criminal charge, is not entitled to an inspection of the grounds upon which the prosecution has *been instituted. In some species of treason, indeed, the prisoner is entitled to a copy of the indictment, a privilege not allowed by the common law, but conferred by act of parliament; but neither in cases of treason, nor of felony, has he any right to a copy of the depositions of witnesses, who are to appear against him. So, when informations are filed by the Attorney-General, on depositions taken under the excise laws, the defendant is not allowed to inspect those depositions. And in a case where an information was filed against an officer of the East India Company, on charges of delinquency founded upon the report of a board of inquiry in India, the court of King's Bench were of opinion, that the defendant had no right to have an inspection of that report, and that the court had no discretionary power to grant it (1). "The practice on indictments at common law, and on informations upon particular statutes," said Mr. Justice Buller on that occasion, "shows it to be clear, that the defendant is not entitled to inspect the evidence on which the prosecution is founded, till the hour of trial." It has been observed (2), that one of the objects which the legislature had in view, in passing the statutes relative to depositions taken by magistrates in cases of felony, was to enable the judge and the jury before whom the prisoner is tried, to see whether the witnesses at the trial are consistent with the account which they have given before the committing magistrate; it seems reasonable, therefore, that at the time of the trial the prisoner on an application to the court, should be allowed to see the deposition of a witness called to give evidence against him, and cross-examine as to any variance or inconsistency in his testimony.

* 325

(5) R. v. Barker, 1 East 186.
(6) Ib. 188.
(1) R. v. Holland, 4 T. R. 691.
(2) See ante, p. 279.

Proceedings of inferior jurisdictions.

The right of inspecting the proceedings of inferior jurisdictions is more limited. It cannot be necessary for the interests of the public, that they should be open for inspection to all persons without distinction; but, on the other hand, it seems reasonable, that, in any suit, where the re-
* 326 *gularity of those proceedings may come into question, a party should have the power of taking a copy of such as have been instituted against himself. In an action of trespass and false imprisonment, brought by the plaintiff, who had been sued in the court of conscience in London, the court of King's Bench allowed the plaintiff to inspect the proceedings, so far as they related to the suit against himself, on the ground that every one has a right to look into the proceedings to which he is a party (1). In another case, where the plaintiff having been fined for neglect of duty, as an under-officer to the commissioners of lieutenancy for the city of London, brought an action of trespass against the defendant for distraining upon him, the court granted the plaintiff a rule for inspecting and taking copies of the rates and assessments made by the commissioners (2). On the same principle, in an action for a malicious prosecution and false imprisonment, the plaintiff may obtain a rule for a copy of the information, upon which he was committed; and, as the original itself ought to be produced at the time of the trial, the court will also grant a rule, calling upon the committing magistrate to cause it to be produced (3).

A different rule, however, was adopted by the court in the case of Dr. Groenvelt v. Dr. Burwell (4), and in Abery v. Dickenson (5). The first of these cases was an action for false imprisonment against the defendants, who justified as censors of the college of physicians by virtue of their charter, by which charter they have power to fine and imprison *pro non bene utendo facultate medicinæ;* they then set

(1) Wilson v. Rogers, 2 Str. 1242.

(2) Edwards v. Vesey, Rep. temp. Hard. 128.

(3) R. v. Smith, 1 Str. 126. Welch v. Richards, Barnes 468. S. P. See also Herbert v. Asburner, 1 Wils. 297; Moody v. Thurston, 1 Stra. 304; and R. v. Commissioners of Land-tax, 2 T. R. 234.

(4) 1 Ld. Raym. 253. 454. Carth. 421. 491. S. C.

(5) Say. 250.

forth, that the plaintiff at such a time and place had administered unwholesome medicines to A. B., and so justified the taking and imprisoning. The counsel for the plaintiff moved, that the register of the college should permit the *plaintiff to have copies of the proceedings and judgment, * 327
to enable him to reply to the defendant's plea in justification; and, in support of the application, it was said that the plaintiff was a party to the judgment, and therefore had a right to a copy, and that it is the usual practice, if an action is brought for a false return to a mandamus, upon which the party is returned to be disfranchised, that the King's Bench will make an order for the plaintiff to have recourse to the public books. But the court refused a rule, saying, (as Lord Raymond reports the case,) "that they could not oblige the college of physicians to permit the plaintiff to have a copy of their proceedings, for they act in a judicial manner, by authority of an act of parliament; and therefore it shall be presumed that they have done right." The report of this case by Carthew differs materially from that by Ld. Raymond. Carthew reports, that the court admitted the rule for inspecting the proceedings, to be usual for the sake of evidence, *after issue joined*, but not by way of assisting the party to plead. The reason given in Ld. Raymond's report, (namely, "that the proceedings must be presumed to be regular, since the college acted in a judicial manner, by authority of an act of parliament,") seems to proceed upon the supposition that the proceedings were truly and correctly set out in the defendant's plea; and on a demurrer, (which admits all the facts in justification,) that reason would have been conclusive; it might then have been justly said against the demurrer, that, the defendants having shown their authority over the plaintiff, and the fact for which he had been punished, being within their jurisdiction as censors, and not traversable in this collateral suit, they could not be liable to an action for what they had done within the limits of their jurisdiction, and in the discharge of their judicial powers. But if, instead of demurring, the plaintiff, in such a case, had ad-

mitted the warrant under which the defendants arrested, him, and replied that "they had committed the trespass of their own wrong and without the residue of the cause alleged in their plea," it would then have been competent for him to show, *that the defendants had exceeded their jurisdiction; and, for the purpose of enabling him to be prepared with this defence, the plaintiff seems to have been entitled, at least after issue joined, to an inspection of such proceedings as had been instituted against himself.

* 328

In the other case, before referred to, of Abery v. Dickenson (1), which was an action of trespass against the defendant for taking a distress for a penalty under an order of certain commissioners, the court of King's Bench is reported to have refused the rule, on the ground that the commissioners were not parties to the suit. The same objection might have been made in the other cases, which have been before cited (2); but the court there allowed an inspection, (although the persons who had the custody of the goods, were not parties to the suit,) because the plaintiff, who applied for the rule, was the object of the proceedings, under which the defendants had acted. The authorities before cited seem, therefore, to establish the principle, that, if proceedings have been instituted by an inferior jurisdiction, the party affected by them ought to be allowed to take a copy of such as relate to himself, in any subsequent suit, in which the regularity of those proceedings may be disputed.

Books of public offices.

Parish registers, books of the India Company relating to the transfer of stock, books of the bank, &c. are for some purposes considered as public books; and persons interested in them, have a right to inspect and take copies of such parts as relate to their interest (3). So the books of the commissioners of the lottery, and their numerical lists, are of a public nature; and kept by the commissioners in trust for the ticket-holders, who are entitled to

(1) Say. 250.
(2) See cases cited in p. 326.
(3) Geery v. Hopkins, 2 Ld. Raym. 851. Warriner v. Giles, 2 Stra. 954. Mayor of London v. Swinland, 1 Barnadist. 455.

an inspection, by rule of court (4). But access is not al-
*lowed to such parish books as are kept only for the pri- * 329
vate use of the parish, and relate to their private interests. An inspection was for that reason refused, in an action of ejectment by an impropriator against the churchwardens of a parish, where a rule was applied for, on the part of the plaintiff, suggesting, that the parish books would make the titles appear, and that they were the common books belonging to the parish at large; but the court were of opinion, that, when the person claims a distinct interest from that of the parish, it is not reasonable to compel the parish to discover their title by showing their books, which are kept only for their own use (1). For the same reason a public company will not be compelled to produce any books relating to their private transactions (2).

Nor will access be granted to the books of public offices, in collateral actions brought by persons, who have no interest in the books; therefore, in a qui tam action for penalties against a clerk in the post-office for interfering in the election of a member of parliament, the prosecutor was not allowed to have a rule for inspecting the books of the post-office, as the cause did not relate to any transaction in the post-office, for which transactions alone those books are kept (3). Nor will the court grant a rule for inspecting the custom-house books, for the purpose of furnishing evidence in an action between two persons who have no interest in the subject-matter, concerning the amount of a particular branch of the public revenue (4).

Court rolls.

The court rolls of a manor are kept in the custody of the lord or his steward, not for the use of the lord alone, but as the common evidence of the manorial rights, to which evidence all the tenants of the manor, whether copy-
*hold or freehold, have an undoubted right of access, as * 330

(4) Schinotti v. Bumstead and others, 36 G. 3., cited from a MS. case in 2 Tidd. Prac. 596.

(1) Cox v. Copping, 5 Mod. 395. 1 Ld. Raym. 337. Lewis v. Baker, 1 Barnardist. 100. Turner v. Gethin, Vin. Ab. tit. Evidence, (F. b.) pl. 11.

(2) Shelling v. Farmer, 1 Stra. 646. Murray v. Thornhill, 2 Stra. 717.

(3) Crew q. t. v. Blackburn, cited 1 Wils. 240. 2 Stra. 1005. S. P.

(4) Atherfold v. Beard, 2 T. R. 614. 616.

well in actions between the tenants and the lord, as between the tenants themselves (1); and it is now a matter of course to grant a rule for the inspection of the court rolls and ancient writings of a manor, on the application of a tenant, who has been refused by the lord. But this privilege is confined to the tenants of the manor, and cannot extend to third persons who have no concern or connexion with the manor court or the court rolls. Thus in an action of trespass, where the question was, whether the place, in which the trespass was alleged to have been committed, was within the manor of the plaintiff, or part of a manor claimed by the defendant, the court held, that the defendant, who, as it appeared from his affidavit, was not a tenant of the plaintiff's manor, nor claimed any interest under him, could not be entitled to an inspection (2). And it may be laid down as a general rule, that where the question is on the custom of a manor between the lord and a stranger, the lord shall not be obliged to let him have an inspection of the rolls, because, in any dispute with a stranger, they may be considered as his private evidence; but if the dispute is between tenants of the manor, or between the lord and a tenant, the lord shall produce the roll, and permit copies to be taken.

Corporation books.

Corporation books are open to the members of the corporation, as court rolls are to the tenants of a manor*.

* 331 *Thus, where a mandamus had been granted to admit a person into a corporation, and by the return it appeared to be a question, whether the master, under whom he had

(1) Roe v. Aylmer, Barnes 236. Hobson v. Parker, ib. 237. Addington v. Clode, 2 Black. Rep. 1030. Folkard v. Hemet, ib. 1061. R. v. Shelley, 3 T. R. 141.

(2) Talbot v. Villeboys, cited from MS. by Buller, J. 3. T. R. 142. Smith v. Davies, 1 Wils. 104. Bp. of Hereford v. Duke of Bridgewater, Bunb. 269. Attorney-General v. City of Coventry, Bunb. 290.

* By stat. 22 G. 3. c. 58. s. 4., a penalty of a hundred pounds is incurred by any officer of the corporation, having the custody of the corporation records, who shall refuse to allow any other officer or member to inspect books and papers, wherein are entered the admission or swearing in of the freemen, burgesses, or members of the corporation, and to take copies or minutes of such admission, &c.

served, had been admitted to his freedom in the corporation, a rule was moved for, on the part of the person claiming admission, to inspect the books of the corporation; and the court held that every member has a right to inspect and take copies of corporation-books for any matter that concerns himself, even in a dispute with strangers; but, as the return had pointed out the necessity of inspecting them for a particular purpose, the rule should be confined to such books as contained the admissions of freemen (1). So, where an information in the nature of a quo warranto had been obtained, at the relation of corporators, against a person charged with unlawfully holding a corporation-office, the court held that these relators were entitled to inspect the books, and that the rule should be limited to the inspection of such papers as related to the subject-matter in discussion (2).

This right of inspecting the muniments of a corporation is confined to the members of the corporate body. A stranger has no better right to inspect corporation-books, than to inspect the books of any private person. On a prosecution against a person for practising physic, (not being a member of the college of physicians, nor having a license, nor being a graduate of either university,) the defendant moved for leave to inspect the books of the college of physicians, but the court refused to grant the rule, as the defendant, who was not a member, had no right to see the books (3). And in an action of trespass, where the defendant justified under a corporation for distraining for a toll, the court refused a similar rule to the plaintiff, who *was a stranger to the corporation (1). A different practice was at one time introduced in courts of law (2), upon the ground, that, on filing a bill for disclosure in a court of * 332

(1) Per Cur. in R. v. Fraternity of Hostmen in Newcastle, 2 Stra. 1222.

(2) R. v. Babb, 3 T. R. 579. Crew q. t. v. Saunders, 2 Stra. 1005. Corporation of Barnstable v. Lathey, 3 T. R. 303.

(3) Dr. West's case, cited 1 Wils. 249.

(1) Cited by De Grey, C. J. in Hodges v. Atkis, 3 Wils. 398., and per Lawrence, J. in 8 T. R. 594. Mayor of Southampton v. Graves, 8 T. R. 590.

(2) Mayor of Lynn v. Denton, 1 T. R. 689. Corporation of Barnstable v. Lathey, 3 T. R. 303.

equity, an inspection would be granted as a matter of course, and that it would only cause unnecessary expense to send them into that court. But this practice, which was not warranted by earlier authorities (3), nor conformable to the practice of courts of equity, has been long discontinued; and the rule of law now established is, that in disputes between several members of the corporation an inspection of the corporation-books will be granted, because each has a right to see them; but an inspection will not be granted in the case of a corporation, when a similar inspection would be refused, if the suit were between private persons. No distinction is to be made, in this respect, between a corporation aggregate and a corporation sole, nor between a corporation sole and a private person, suing in his individual capacity (4).

The rule for inspecting court-rolls, corporation-books, and other public writings, will not be allowed, where the party who has them in his custody, would, by producing them for inspection, disclose any evidence of a criminal nature, or expose himself to a prosecution. On an information, therefore, against several persons, for executing an office of trust without taking the oaths, the court refused a motion for leave to inspect some books kept by the defendants, in which they had entered their elections, receipts, and disbursements, as it would have compelled them to give evidence against themselves in a criminal prosecution (5): and a similar motion was refused, on an information against two overseers for making a rate without the
* 333 *concurrence of the churchwardens (1). Another case to the same effect is the case of the King v. Dr. Purnel (2), where, on an information against the defendant, for a misdemeanour in his office of vice-chancellor of the university of Oxford, a rule for taking a copy of the university-

(3) Dr. West's case, cited 1 Wils. 240. R. v. Dr. Bridgeman, 2 Stra. 1203. Mayor of Exeter v. Coleman, Barnes 238. Hodges v. Atkis, 3 Wils. 398.

(4) 8 T. R. 593.

(5) R. v. Mead, 2 Ld. Raym. 927. R. v. Worsenham, 1 Ld. Raym. 705. R. v. Cornelius, 2 Stra. 1210.

(1) R. v. Lee, cited 1 Wills. 240.

(2) 1 Wils. 239.

statutes, in the care of the keeper of the archives, was refused by the Court of King's Bench, after great consideration; and the principle, that no man shall be bound to accuse himself, was fully recognised. This principle will not apply to the case of informations in the nature of a quo warranto, for usurping a franchise or intruding into a corporation-office; for such informations, although originally and strictly criminal methods of prosecution, are applied to the purpose of trying civil rights, and are considered at present as merely civil proceedings. On an information, therefore, exhibited at the relation of a member of a corporation, against a person for unlawfully executing an office, the relator, who as member has a right and interest in the books of the corporation, may obtain an inspection and copy of such, and such only, as relate to the subject matter in discussion (3).

The motion for a rule to inspect and take a copy, where an action is depending, is founded on an affidavit stating the circumstances under which the inspection is claimed; as, (where a party applies for the inspection of court-rolls,) that he is tenant of the manor, and that an application has been made to the lord or his steward, for leave to make the required inspection, which they refused (4); and, on such an affidavit the rule will be made absolute in the first instance (5).

With regard to the proper stage of the proceedings for making the application, the court has refused the motion in an action against a corporation upon a right of toll, *be-***cause issue was not joined*, so that it could not appear, * 334
whether an inspection would be necessary (1.) And in the case of Dr. Groenvelt v. Dr. Burwell, before mentioned, where the plaintiff applied for a copy of the proceedings instituted against him by the college of physicians, the court admitted the rule for inspecting the proceedings to be usual, for the sake of evidence, *after issue joined*, but

(3) R. v. Babb, 3 T. R. 579.
(4) Roe v. Aylmar, Barnes 236.
(5) R. v. Shelley, 3 T. R. 141.
(1) Hodges v. Atkis, 3 Wils. 398. 2 Black. Rep. 877., S. C.

not by way of assisting the party to plead (2). If a rule has been granted to show cause, why a mandamus should not be awarded, the court will not make a rule for inspecting and taking copies, until the first rule is made absolute, and a return is made to the mandamus (3); and it has been thought the most convenient practice, where a rule nisi for a quo warranto information has been obtained, not to grant an inspection, until the information is granted (4).

If no action is depending, the proper motion is for a rule to show cause why a mandamus should not issue, commanding the officer, who has the custody of the books, to permit the party to inspect and take a copy. The affidavit, upon which this motion is founded, ought to state clearly the right under which the inspection is claimed. In a case of this kind, where an inspection of the court-rolls of a manor was applied for, the party stated in his affidavit a prima facie title to a copyhold of the manor; and the court of King's Bench held, that as he was clearly entitled to the copyhold, unless it had been conveyed away by those under whom he claimed, he had a right to see whether any such conveyance appeared on the rolls, and the court therefore made the rule absolute, so far as related to the copyhold lands, the subject of the party's claim (5).

(2) Carthew 421.
(3) Per Cur. in R. v. Justices of Surry, Say. 144.
(4) Per Ashurst, J. in R. v. Babb, 3 T. R. 531. R. v. Hollister, Rep. temp. Hard. 245.
(5) R. v. Lucas, 10 East 235.; and see 3 T. R. 142.

* 335

*CHAP. VIII.

Of the Proof of Private Writings.

The next branch of our subject, which remains to be considered, relates to private writings. In treating of this part of written evidence, we shall not attempt to describe the various kinds and requisites of private writings, which

would far exceed the limits of the present work, but shall consider only two of the principal kinds, deeds and wills. The method of proving these is the subject of the following chapter; and the two succeeding chapters will treat shortly of the requisite of stamping, and of the admissibility of parol evidence to explain written instruments.

Sect. I.

Of the Proof of Deeds.

Subpœna duces tecum.

If any deed or other writing, necessary to be produced at the trial of a cause, is in the possession of a third person, the legal process for compelling him to produce it is by suing out a writ of subpœna ad testificandum, (to enforce his personal attendance,) and inserting a special clause, called a duces tecum, which specifies the writings required, and commands him to produce them at the trial. The writ of subpœna duces tecum, like some other writs of undoubted antiquity, is not to be found in the registrum brevium; but it can be traced in practice as far back as the time of Charles II., and probably existed much earlier, as such a compulsory process is essential to the constitution of courts of justice. A witness, served with this subpœna, is obliged to attend; and, though it will be a question for the consideration of the judge, whether he ought to be compelled to produce the writings in his possession, yet undoubtedly he ought to be ready to produce them, if ordered by the court (*a*); and, in case of disobedience without sufficient *cause, will be liable to an attachment, or to a special action for damages (1). If the writing, which he is called upon to produce, would have a tendency to subject

* 336

(1) Amey v. Long, 9 East 473.

(*a*) Vide ante, 12. n. (*b*).

him to a criminal charge, or to a penalty, or any kind of forfeiture, the court will excuse him from producing it, as well as from answering any question of the same tendency; but, from analogy to the rule respecting parol testimony, (and there seems to be no good reason for allowing a greater privilege in the one case than in the other,) he would not be excused from producing a paper in his possession, relevant to the matter in issue, on the ground that it might establish, or tend to establish against him the fact of his being in debt, or subject to a civil suit (2).

Notice to produce.

If writings are in the possession of a party to the suit, the other party has, in general, no means of compelling their production; and the utmost, therefore, that can be expected of him, in such circumstances, is to give the best evidence which the nature of the case admits. In some instances, indeed, where the writing is deposited in the custody of a defendant, as a trustee for all parties interested, courts of law will order him to furnish the plaintiff with a copy, and produce the original at the trial. Thus, in an action for a stake won at a horse-race, the defendant, who was the stake-holder, was ordered to produce a copy of the racing articles, without which the plaintiff could not proceed (3.) So, in a late case, in an action of covenant, the court of Common Pleas granted the plaintiff a rule for taking a copy of an indenture of assignment of a lease, made between the plaintiff and defendant, as the only part of the indenture which had been executed, was in the hands of the defendant (4); the parties, in this case, having executed one part only of the indenture, in order to save the expense of double stamps, the court thought it a necessary consequence, that the party, who
* 337 *had the custody, undertook to produce the deed, when necessary, for the use of the other contracting party. And, upon the same principle, in an action by seamen to

(2) See Stat. 46 G. 3. c. 37. ante, p. 208.

(3) Gracewood v. ——, Barnes 439.

(4) Blakey v. Porter, 1 Taunt. 386. King v. King, 4 Taunt. 666.

recover wages, the defendant is compellable to produce the ship's articles (1); for, the contract for wages always remains in the possession of the master, and the statutes (which require a written agreement in the case of foreign voyages (2), and in the case of certain vessels employed in the coasting trade (3),) expressly enact, that where it becomes necessary to produce the contract in court, no obligation shall lie on the seamen to produce it, but on the master or owners of the ship; and that no seaman shall fail, in any suit or process for the recovery of wages, for want of its production.

In an action between the plaintiff (a factor) and defendant, (a grazier), the court of King's Bench, on the motion of the defendant, made a rule for the plaintiff to show cause, why he should not produce at the trial the several books, in which he entered the amount of beasts sold, and of money received on the defendant's account; and, no cause being shown, the rule was made absolute (4). The rule which Lord Mansfield laid down in such cases, is said to be, that, wherever the defendant would be entitled to a discovery, he should have it in a court of law, without going into equity (5) (*a*). In causes on policies of insu-

(1) Johnson v. Lewellyn, 6 Esp. N. P. C. 101. 1 Taunt. 366.
(2) St. 2 G. 2. c. 36.
(3) St. 31 G. 3. c. 39.
(4) Goater v. Nunnely, 2 Stra. 1139. Ward v. Apprice, 6 Mod. Rep. 264. contra.
(5) Barry v. Alexander, 25 G. 3, K. B. 1 Tidd. Pr. 589.

(*a*) By the 15th section of the judiciary act of the U. S. it is provided that the courts of the U. S. "Shall have power in the trial of actions at law, on motion and due notice thereof being given, to require the parties to produce books or writings in their possession or power, which contain evidence pertinent to the issue, in cases and under circumstances where they might be compelled to produce the same by the ordinary rules of proceeding in chancery; and if a plaintiff shall fail to comply with such order, to produce books or writings, it shall be lawful for the courts respectively, on motion, to give the like judgment for the defendant as in cases of nonsuit; and if a defendant shall fail to comply with such order, to produce books or writings, it shall be lawful for the

rance, it is now the common practice to obtain a judge's order, calling upon the assured to produce to the underwriters, upon affidavit, all papers in the possession of the former relative to the matters in issue (*b*); and if the one party is not content with such papers as are produced under the order, the other party will be obliged to make an affidavit, denying the relevancy of those which he with-
* 338 holds (6). This *practice has been adopted for its great convenience, as it saves the delay and expense of a bill in equity. But the practice in Chancery invariably is, that a party is entitled only to extracts of letters, if the other party will swear that the passages extracted are the only parts relating to the subject-matter (1).

But, in general, one party has not the means of compelling the other party to produce any writings in his possession, however necessary they may be for the prosecution of his suit. If such evidence is required, the rule, both in civil and in criminal cases (2), is to give the opposite party or his attorney (3) a regular notice to produce

(6) Clifford v. Taylor, 1 Taunt. 167. Goldschmidt v. Marryat, 1 Camph. 562.

(1) 1 Taunt. 167.

(2) The Attorney-General v. Le Merchant, 2 T. R. 201. n.

(3) 1 T. R. 203. n. Cates q. t. v. Winter, 3 T. R. 306.

---

courts respectively, on motion as aforesaid, to give judgment against him or her by default." The act does not designate to whom the notice shall be given, but the court will always keep the cause under their control for the purposes of substantial justice, and never suffer either party to be entrapped. If, for instance, notice is served on an attorney, where his client lives at a great distance, this will always be deemed a sufficient reason to postpone the trial, till a full opportunity has been afforded for the attorney's communicating the rule to the client. If, likewise, the court find that the deeds are actually on record, they will not indulge the party with a rule for producing them, merely as a cheap mode of procuring evidence. *Geyger's Lessee* v. *Geyger*, 2 *Dall.* 332.

(*b*) Such a rule was granted by the Supreme Court in the case of *Lawrence* v. *Ocean Insurance Co.* 11 *Johns. Rep.* 245., where the form of the rule is given.

the original (*a*); not, that on proof of the notice he is compellable to give evidence against himself, or that, if he refuses to produce the papers required, such a circumstance is to be considered as conclusive against him (4), but the consequence will merely be, that the other party, who has done all in his power to supply the best evidence, will be allowed to go into evidence of an inferior kind, and may read an examined copy, or give parol evidence of the contents. But, before this secondary evidence can be admitted, it ought to be clearly shown, that the writing required is in the possession of the other party, and that a notice to produce it has been regularly served (*b*). If, in compliance with a notice, the party produces the writings in his possession, he is entitled to have the whole read (5) (*c*): and if a writing produced refers to others with such particularity as to make it necessary to inspect them, that the sense may be complete, he may insist on having these also read in evidence (6) (*d*).

(4) Cooper v. Gibbons, 3 Campb. 363.

(5) See ante, p. 79. 265.

(6) Johnson v. Gilson, 4 Esp. N. P. C. 21.

(*a*) Vide *Waring* v. *Warren*, 1 *Johns. Rep.* 340. *Rogers & Rogers* v. *Van Hoesen & others*, 12 *Johns. Rep.* 221. *Dobbin* v. *Watkins*, *Coleman* 33. A party who cross-examines a witness cannot introduce through him any other proof, than would have been legal had he originally produced the witness, and therefore he cannot examine him as to the contents of a written instrument, without showing that notice had been given to the opposite party. *Jackson d. Van Slyck & others* v. *Son*, 2 *Caines' Rep.* 178.

(*b*) It has been held that the necessity of proving notice was not dispensed with, by showing that the deed had been lost while in the hands of a person who had possession of it for the opposite party. *Smallwood* v *Mitchell*, 2 *Hayw.* 145.

(*c*) Vide *Lawrence* v. *Ocean Insurance Co.* 11 *Johns. Rep.* 260.

(*d*) Whether a paper produced pursuant to a notice for that purpose immediately becomes evidence, and may be used by the party producing it? or may the party giving the notice, first inspect, and then reject it or not? *Quære.* Vide *Lawrence* v. *Van*

The rule which requires, that a party shall have previous notice to produce a written instrument in his possession, *before the contents can be proved as evidence in the cause, has been made with good reason; in order that the party may not be taken by surprise, in cases where it must be uncertain whether such evidence will be brought forward at the trial by the adverse party. But this reason will not apply to cases where, from the nature of the proceedings the defendant has notice that the plaintiff means to charge him with the possession of the instrument. It cannot here be necessary to give any other notice, than the action itself supplies. In an action of trover, therefore, for a bond, the plaintiff was allowed to give parol evidence of the contents, to support the general description of the instrument in the declaration, without having given the defendant previous notice to produce it (1). And on a prosecution for stealing a promissory note or other writing described in the indictment, parol evidence of the contents will be received, without any formal notice

* 339

(1) How v. Hall, 14 East 274. Scott v. Jones, 4 Taunt. 865.

Horne, 1 *Caines' Rep.* 276. Where the two judges who delivered opinions differed on this point. In *Kenney* v. *Van Horne & Clarkson*, Spencer, J. delivering the opinion of the court, says "It appears to me that the notice to produce a paper and calling for its inspection, ought to be considered as analogous to a bill for discovery, where most certainly the answer is not evidence but for the adverse party." 1 *Johns. Rep.* 395. In *Sayer* v. *Kitchen*, 1 *Esp. Rep.* 211. ante, 211. Ld. Kenyon held that if one party calls for the other party's books, but when they are produced, declines using them, the mere calling for them will not make them evidence for the adverse party. In *Wharam* v. *Routledge*, 5 *Esp. Rep.* 235. Lord Ellenborough says—"You cannot ask for a book of the opposite party, and be determined upon the inspection of it, whether you will use it or not. If you call for it, you make it evidence for the other side, if they think fit to use it." Vide ante, 211, 212.

to the prisoner to produce the original (*a*). In Aickles' case (2), on an indictment for stealing a bill of exchange, all the judges held, that such evidence had been properly admitted, though it was proved in that case, that the bill had been seen only a few days before the trial, in a state of negotiation, in the hands of a third person, who had been served with a subpœna duces tecum, but who did not appear. And in Layer's case (3), on an indictment for high treason, where it was proved, that the prisoner had shown a person the paper, containing the treasonable matter laid in the indictment, and then immediately put it into his pocket, that person was permitted to give parol evidence of the contents of the paper. And in the case of De la Motte (4), on an indictment for a traitorous correspondence with the French government, where the question was, whether examined copies of the treasonable papers, (which had been *secretly opened at the post-office, and copied, and then forwarded to their place of destination,) were admissible in evidence, the court held, that they might be admitted, after proof that the originals were in the hand-writing of the prisoner (*b*). * 340

Nor does the principle of the rule apply to the case, where a party to the suit has fraudulently got possession of a written instrument belonging to a third person; as

(2) 1 Leach Cr. C. 330.
(3) 6 St. Tr. 263.
(4) Cor. Buller, J. and Heath, J. O. B. 1781, 1 East P. C. 124. from MS. of Gould, J. These copies were rejected on another ground, because the originals had not been traced to the prisoner's possession. See Howell's Coll. of St. Tr. vol. 21. p. 737.

(*a*) Acc. *The Commonwealth* v. *Messinger & others*, 1 *Binney* 273. *The People* v. *Holbrook*, 13 *Johns. Rep.* 90.

(*b*) So, in a civil action, in Connecticut, under the statute of that state, by a person injured by a forged note, against the forger, it was held, that the note being in the possession of the defendant, notice to produce it was unnecessary. *Ross* v. *Bruce*, 1 *Day* 100. Where an attorney, a witness, refused to produce a paper delivered to him by his client, (whether a party to the cause on trial, or not, does not appear,) a copy was allowed to be given in evidence. *Lynde* v. *Judd*, 3 *Day* 499.

where a witness was called, on the part of the defendant, to produce a letter written to him by the plaintiff, and it appeared that after the commencement of the action he had given it to the plaintiff; in this case, though notice to produce had not been given, parol evidence of the contents was admitted, because the paper belonged to the witness, and had been secreted, in fraud of the subpœna (1).

The counterpart of a deed is evidence against the person who signed it, and against his assignee, without giving notice to produce the original. Thus in an action against the master of an apprentice, for not inserting in the indenture of apprenticeship the true consideration, an averment in the declaration, that A. B. by a certain indenture put himself apprentice to the defendant, may be proved by that part of the indenture which the defendant executed (2). So, in an action of ejectment, upon a condition of re-entry for non-payment of rent, against the assignee of a lease, proof of the counterpart, executed by the original tenant, is sufficient proof of the assignee's holding on the same terms (3).

Another case may here be mentioned, in which a majority of the judges in the court of King's Bench were of opinion, that want of notice was not a sufficient objection
* 341 *against receiving parol evidence of the contents of a deed, because it appeared that the deed itself was in court in the possession of the opposite party (1). At the trial of an ejectment, on the several demises of Haldane and Urry, title was deduced to Haldane under a will; but one of the plaintiff's witnesses said, on cross-examination, that Haldane had conveyed all interest in the premises to Urry, before the time of the demise in the declaration, and that the deed was in court. Upon this, it was insisted, that as the plaintiff's witness proved the title out of Haldane, and as the deed of conveyance was in the court, the deed ought

(1) Leeds v. Cook, 4 Esp. N. P. C. 256.
(2) Burleigh v. Stibbs, 5 T.R. 465.
(3) Roe dem. West v. Davis, 7 East 363.

(1) Doe on the several demises of Haldane and Urry v. Harvey, 4 Burr. 2484.

to be produced in evidence to show a title in Urry, the other lessor of the plaintiff. The counsel for the plaintiff, on the contrary, refused to produce the deed, insisting that the plaintiff ought to recover under one or the other of the lessors; for, if the one had parted with the title, the other had acquired it. But Mr. J. Aston, who tried the cause, being of opinion that the plaintiff ought to give further evidence to ascertain the title under which he was to recover the term, nonsuited the plaintiff; and on a motion afterwards for setting aside this nonsuit, Lord Mansfield, after observing that in the action of ejectment the plaintiff could not recover but upon the strength of his own title, said, "it was plain the plaintiff had no title under Haldane, who had conveyed away all the interest in the premises to the other lessor, and, that as to his claim of a title under Urry, the plaintiff had not proved any title; the jury could not have found for the plaintiff under the deed of conveyance to Urry, unless it were produced, and probably there was something in the deed which would have shown that Urry had no title." Lord Mansfield laid the principal stress on the fact of the plaintiff's refusing to produce the conveyance from Haldane, which was admitted to be in court. "The want of notice," he said, "was no objection in this case, because they had the deed in court; and the refusal to produce it warranted the strongest presumption, *that neither of the lessors had any title." Mr. Justice * 342
Aston and Mr. Justice Willes agreed in opinion with Lord Mansfield. But Mr. Justice Yates differed from the rest of the court. "He founded himself," he said, "upon the rules of evidence. The fact of the conveyance coming out on cross-examination could make no difference. The plaintiff's counsel were not obliged to produce the deed, for no man can be obliged to produce evidence against himself; the only consequence of a notice to produce would have been the admission of inferior evidence." Upon this case it may be observed, that the fact of Haldane's having conveyed away all his interest to Urry seems to have been assumed as satisfactorily proved; but from the opinion of

Mr. Justice Yates, (which seems to be the better opinion,) it may be collected, that there was no legal proof of any conveyance of title out of Haldane, and that the answer of the witness, upon which the defendant's argument rested, was as inadmissible in evidence on the cross-examination, as it would have been on an examination in chief. The true objection to such evidence is, that the witness was speaking to the contents of a deed, when there had been no notice given to produce the original; and it does not appear to be a sufficient answer to say, that the deed is in court; for, if the party had received a regular notice to produce it, he might have come prepared with evidence to repel any inference, which the production of the deed might have raised against him.

Proof of notice.

A parol notice, to produce writings, may be proved by a third person who delivered the notice, or by one who heard it delivered; and a written notice may be proved by a duplicate original (1). A notice to quit may be proved in the same manner by a duplicate original, in an action of ejectment. It may be objected, that the duplicate is not the best evidence of the contents of the notice delivered, as the supposed duplicate original may be inaccurate, and the *contents may be proved to a certainty by the production of the notice itself; but, on the other hand, extreme inconvenience would arise from a stricter medium of proof; for, if a duplicate notice to quit is not sufficient, no more is a duplicate of the notice to produce, and thus notices might be required in infinitum. The practice of allowing duplicates of this kind in evidence seems further to be sanctioned by this principle, that, as the original delivered is in the hands of the other party, it is in his power to contradict the duplicate original, by producing the other, if they vary (1). Upon the same principle, where a notice is given to a magistrate previous to the commencement of an action against him, or where a demand is made of a copy of a warrant

*343

(1) Gotlieb v. Danvers, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 455. Surtees v. Hubbard, 4 Esp. N. P. C. 203.

(1) Per Lord Eldon, C. J. Jory v. Orchard, 2 Bos. & Pull. 41.

preparatory to an action against a constable, if another paper is made out at the same time precisely to the same effect as that delivered, both may be considered originals, and the paper so preserved may be received in evidence without a notice to produce the one delivered (2). From analogy to these cases, in an action on an attorney's bill, though the plaintiff cannot produce parol evidence of the contents of the bill delivered, without giving notice to produce it, yet a copy, made out at the same time and proved to be correct, has been admitted to be good evidence (3). A duplicate, which has been taken from an original letter at a single impression, by means of a copying machine, is still only a copy; and therefore cannot be read, without a previous notice to the other party to produce the original (4) (*a*).

Deed produced under notice, how proved.

If a party, in compliance with a notice, should produce a deed, or other instrument, called for by the adverse party, the next question is, which of the parties ought to prove the execution, the one who calls for its production, or the other who produces. The general rule, laid down by Mr. Justice Buller, is, that "in civil actions, where a plaintiff *wishes to give in evidence a deed in the defendant's custody, he gives the defendant notice to produce it; and the deed, when produced, must prima facie be taken to be duly executed; because the plaintiff, not knowing who are the subscribing witnesses, cannot come prepared at the trial to prove the execution (1)." Therefore, in a case of settle- *344

(2) 2 Bos. & Pull. 39.

(3) Anderson v. May, 2 Bos. & Pull. 237. Philipson v. Chase, 2 Campb. 110. S. P. Ackland v. Pearce, 2 Campb. 601.

(4) Nodin v. Murray, 3 Campb. 228.

(1) 2 T. R. 43.

(*a*) The contents of the notice may be proved by parol. *Tower* v. *Wilson*, 3 *Caines' Rep.* 174. When the notice is general, to produce a paper on the *trial*, it does not apply merely to the circuit subsequent to the date of the notice, but extends to the time of trial, whenever it may take place. *Jackson* d. *Burr & O'Reilly* v. *Shearman*, 6 *Johns. Rep.* 19.

ment, where the respondents had given notice to the appellants to produce an indenture of apprenticeship, by which the pauper was bound in the appellant parish, and which indenture was accordingly produced at the trial of the appeal, the court of King's Bench held, that the court below ought not to have required the respondents to prove the execution, but that the indenture should have been admitted prima facie as duly executed (2).

In the next reported case on this subject, the case of Gordon and others v. Secretan (3), Ld. Ellenborough, C. J. said, that the case of the King v. Middlezoy had been much questioned at the time, and since overruled; and that the production of an instrument at the trial, in pursuance of a notice, would not supersede the necessity of proving it by one of the subscribing witnesses, as in ordinary cases. And Mr. Justice Lawrence added, that this point had been so ruled by Lord Kenyon in a subsequent case, where the adverse party, having notice to produce a written instrument, produced it accordingly at the trial, and Lord Kenyon held, that the party who called for it, was bound to call one of the subscribing witnesses to prove the execution. In the case of Gordon and others v. Secretan, which was an action upon a policy of insurance on shipped goods, the plaintiffs averred in their declaration, that they were interested in the subject-matter of the insurance, and the defendant, intending to dispute that fact at the trial, gave the plaintiffs notice to produce certain articles of agreement made between them and the captain of the ship, by which, as it was contended, *the contrary would clearly appear: in pursuance of this notice, the plaintiffs at the trial produced the instrument attested by two witnesses, and insisted that the defendant should call one of them to prove the execution. The point was so ruled at nisi prius, and afterwards confirmed by the court of King's Bench. From this case, therefore, it might be inferred, that, if a party to a suit, in consequence of a

* 345

(2) R. v. Inhabitants of Middlezoy, 2 T. R. 41.

(3) 8 East 548. Wetherston v. Edgington, 2 Campb. 94. S. P.

notice, produces an instrument executed between himself and others, yet that the other party, though a stranger to the instrument, ought to prove the execution, if he means to avail himself of it in evidence.

The rule, however, has been properly restricted by the late case of Pearce v. Hooper and others (1). That was an action of trespass, and the question at the trial was, whether the place, in which the trespass was alleged, belonged to the plaintiff as part of a certain estate; the defendants gave notice to the plaintiff to produce a deed of conveyance, in which the estate had been conveyed to the plaintiff by a description limited to a number of acres, which, it was said, would necessarily exclude the place in question; the plaintiff produced the conveyance, and, on the authority of the cases before mentioned, it was ruled, that the defendant ought to prove the execution, which, as he was not prepared to prove, the instrument could not be received in evidence. But on a motion afterwards for a new trial, the court of Common Pleas were of opinion, that it was not necessary for the defendants, in this case, to call the attesting witness to prove the execution. The court admitted that the mere possession of an instrument by one party cannot, in general, absolve the other party, who calls for it, from the necessity of producing the attesting witness. An instance to illustrate this, said the chief justice, had been properly put in the case of a will, cited in Gordon v. Secretan; for, supposing that an heir at law is in possession of a will, and the devisee brings an ejectment, and calls on the heir *to produce the will, there the heir claims not under the will, but against the will, and it would be hard, that the will should be taken as proved against him, because he produces it. But that is very different from the case, where a man is called upon to produce a deed, under which he holds an estate. The defendant (added the chief justice, with reference to the case then before the court,) has no interest in the fee sim- * 346

(1) 3 Taunt. 62.

ple of the estate, if this deed does not convey it: if then he produces the deed under which he claims, shall it not be taken to be a good deed, (so far as relates to the execution,) as against himself?" The other judges concurred in opinion, and a new trial was granted. The result therefore at present appears to be, that when a party to a suit, in pursuance of a notice, produces an instrument, to which he is a party, and under which he claims a beneficial estate, it will not be necessary that the other party, a stranger to the instrument, should call an attesting witness to prove the execution (*a*); but that, in other cases, the execution ought to be regularly proved by the party who offers the instrument as part of his evidence in the cause*.

Secondary evidence, when admitted.

If a party intend to use a deed or any other written instrument in evidence, he ought to produce the original, if he has it in his possession; but, if the instrument is in the possession of the other party, who refuses to produce it after a reasonable notice, or if the original is lost or destroyed, secondary evidence, which is the best that the nature of the case allows, will in that case be admitted. The party, after proving any of these circumstances, to account
* 347 *for the absence of the original, may read the counter-part; or, if there is no counter-part, an examined copy; or, if there should be no examined copy, he may give parol evi-

* The plaintiff may have a rule nisi, calling on the defendant to produce a deed before the commissioners of the stamp-office, to be stamped; or to give the plaintiff a copy of a deed, in order that he may declare upon it. Cooke v. Stocks, 36 G. 3. K. B. 1 Tid. Prac. 486. Bateman v. Philips, 52 G. 3. C. P. ib. And where the plaintiff commenced an action of covenant on an indenture of assignment of a lease, only one part of which had been executed, and that was in the hands of the defendant, the court of Common Pleas granted the plaintiff a rule nisi, for reading and taking a copy of this part. Blakey v. Porter, 1 Taunt. 386. See ante, p. 336.

(*a*) So, in *Betts* v. *Badger*, 12 *Johns. Rep.* 223. (in which the court do not appear to have been aware of the decision in 3 *Taunt.*) it was decided, that where a deed was produced, pursuant to notice, by a person who was a party to it, and derived a benefit from it, it was prima facie to be taken to be duly executed.

dence of the contents (1). Proof by a witness, that the paper in question was thrown aside as useless, and that he believes it to be lost or destroyed, will be sufficient to let in the secondary evidence (2). And, in a late case, where it appeared, that the defendant had acknowledged the receipt of a letter of a particular date, which he refused to produce at the trial, it was ruled, that an entry in a letter-book, (purporting to be a copy of a letter of the same date from the plaintiff to the defendant, and inserted by a deceased clerk, who kept the book according to the course of business, and with great punctuality,) was admissible evidence of the contents of the letter in question (3). It is scarcely necessary to observe, that the rule in this respect is precisely the same both in criminal and in civil cases (*a*).

If the ground for admitting the secondary evidence is, that the original has been lost, it ought to be shown that every reasonable inquiry has been made, and the last person, into whose possession it is traced, should be called to give some account of the instrument (*b*). Thus, in a case

(1) Villiers v. Villiers, 2 Atk. 71.
(2) R. v. Mr. Just. Johnson, 7 East 66. 8 East 284.
(3) Pritt v. Fairclough, 3 Campb. 305.

(*a*) In the following cases, secondary evidence was admitted of the contents of a writing proved to have been lost. *Livingston* v. *Rogers*, 1 *Caines' Cas. in Error*, xxxvii. S. C. 2 *Johns. Cas.* 488. *Jackson* d. *Donaldson* v. *Lucett*, 2 *Caines' Rep.* 363. *Jackson* d. *Livingston and others* v. *Neely*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 374. *Spencer* v. *Spencer*, *Rep. C. C. U. S. First Circt.* 622. *Jones et al.* v. *Fales*, 5 *Mass. Rep.* 101. *Drum* v. *Lessee of Simpson*, 6 *Binney* 478. *Jackson* d. *Gillespy and others* v. *Woolsey*, 11 *Johns. Rep.* 446. *Den* d. *Baker* v. *Webb*, 1 *Hayw.* 71. *Rochell* ads. *Holmes*, 2 *Bay* 487. *Anderson* v. *Robson*, *Id.* 495. *Vide post*, 356 n.

(*b*) Vide *Angel* v. *Felton*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 149. *Little* v. *Lessee of Delancey*, 5 *Binney* 266. *Meyer and another* v. *Barker*, 6 *Binney* 228. *Cary* v. *Campbell & Cook*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 363. Where a written agreement was placed in the hands of a common friend, who upon his removal from the scene of the transaction

of settlement, where it appeared that an indenture of apprenticeship consisted of two parts, one of which had been destroyed, and the other had come to the hands of a person who was living and had not been subpœnaed, but had been heard to say, that he could not find the part, and did not know where it was, the court of King's Bench was of opinion, that this was not a sufficient ground for admitting parol evidence of the contents (4). But if the indenture were to be traced into the hands of a deceased person, who, in answer to inquiries respecting it, had stated, that it was destroyed while in his possession, any further search for
* 348 *this part of the instrument would be unnecessary and nu-

(4) R. v. Castleton, 6 T. R. 236. R. v. St. Sepulchre, 2 Bott. 353.

---

placed it with his father, who died; and after proof of these facts a witness swore that after the father's death, he, together with the son-in-law of the father, to whom all his papers came, made diligent search among the father's papers, but could not find the writing; it was held that this was sufficient proof of the loss, to lay a ground for one of the parties to prove the contents, without the oath of the son-in-law himself as to the search and not finding. *Caufman* v. *Congregation of Cedar Spring*, 6 *Binney* 59. Evidence by a person that he had delivered a deed to the clerk of the county to be recorded, and that search had been made in the clerk's office, and that it could not be found, is not sufficient evidence of the loss of a deed, to entitle the party to read a copy in evidence, unless it be shown that the deed was never re-delivered by the clerk. *Jackson* d. *Dunbar and others* v. *Todd*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 300. To entitle a party to give parol evidence of the contents of a will, alleged to be destroyed, where there is not sufficient evidence to warrant the conclusion of its absolute destruction, the party must show that he has made diligent search and inquiry after the will, in those places where it would most probably be found if in existence, as in the office of the surrogate of the county where the testator died, or in the office of the judge of probates, or that inquiry had been made of the executors. *Jackson* d. *Bush & others* v. *Hasbrouck*, 12 *Johns. Rep.* 192.

gatory. Thus, in a very late case (1) on a similar question of settlement, where it appeared, that only one part of the indenture was executed, that the pauper and master were both dead at the time of the trial, and that an inquiry had been made of the pauper, (who said, that the indenture had been given up to him after the expiration of the apprenticeship, and that it had been burnt,) and also of the daughter and executrix of the master, (who said, she knew nothing about it,) under these circumstances the court of King's Bench were of opinion, that a sufficient inquiry had been made to render parol evidence of the contents admissible; and the distinction, taken between this case and that of the King and Castleton, was, that, in the former, there was evidence of a fact which made a further search necessary, but that here a fact appeared in evidence, which made a search nugatory. If two parts of a deed, or more, have been executed, the loss or destruction of all the parts should be proved, before secondary evidence of the contents can be received (2); and the original deed ought to be proved to have been duly executed (3), unless proof of the execution would be dispensed with, if the original itself were produced, or unless the want of the original is occasioned by the default of the other party, in which case, the execution may reasonably be presumed against him. So where an original note of hand is lost, a copy cannot be read in evidence, unless the note is proved to be genuine (4) (*a*).

(1) R. v. West Riding of Yorkshire, Easter Term, April 17, 1815. MS.

(2) Bull. N. P. 254. R. v. Castleton, 6 T. R. 236.

(3) R. v. Sir T. Culpepper, Skinner, 673. per Holt, C. J.

(4) Per Ld. Hardwicke, C. J. Goodier v. Lake, 1 Atk. 446.

(*a*) The defendant entered into an obligation with the plaintiff as his surety, at Caraccas, which not being performed, the plaintiff, the surety, was compelled by proceedings at law, to pay the amount for his principal: in an action by the surety against the principal, it was held, that a copy of the obligation, (which according to the laws of the Spanish colonies, was made before a

The loss of a deed, by time and accident, or by any other casualty, is a sufficient reason for dispensing with a profert in pleading, when otherwise a profert might be necessary (5) (*b*); or it may be pleaded, that the deed is in the

(5) Read v. Brookman, 3 T. R. 151. Bolton v. Bp. of Carlisle, 2 H. Black. 259.

---

notary, who kept the original and delivered copies to the parties,) authenticated according to the laws of Spain, connected with evidence that the original could not be procured, and with proof of admissions by the defendant of its authenticity, and of the breach of the contract, was sufficient, without producing the decree against the plaintiff, and the original obligation, or a sworn copy of it. "It is unnecessary" says Thompson, Ch. J. in delivering the opinion of the court, in this case, "definitively to say, whether the *lex loci* ought so far to prevail, as to require these notarial copies to be admitted in evidence here, in the same manner as in the Spanish tribunals. I am inclined to think, however, they ought not to be received as sufficient, per se; but I cannot think they are to be entirely disregarded and treated as mere nullities. They ought to be received as forming a part of the inferior evidence of the execution of the instrument, when the original cannot be produced and proved. It appears to be a part of the official duty of the notary to give copies; he is specially intrusted with that power; and in giving such copies, he acts under his oath of office. The instrument is executed before him in his official capacity, and an official certified copy, necessarily implies that he saw the instrument executed. In what respect does this differ from an examination upon a commission? He can only swear he saw the instrument executed, and that the copy furnished by him is under oath. Besides, we ought to be cautious in declaring that we will receive nothing short of the examination of the notary, under a commission, as there is no mode of enforcing such examination; nor is a sworn copy proved by a person who has compared it with the original, any higher or better evidence than that furnished by the notary under his oath of office. But the evidence furnished in the case before us is more satisfactory than either, arising out of the repeated, uniform, and uncontradicted confessions of the defendant, contained in his letters, and to witnesses whose testimony was before the jury." *Mauri* v. *Heffernan*, 13 *Johns. Rep.* 58.

(*b*) Vide *Cutts* v. *United States, Rep. C. C. U. S. First Circt.* 69.

hands of the opposite party, or destroyed by him (6). But *if the plaintiff, instead of declaring upon the deed, as lost or destroyed, inadvertently pleads with a profert, and the defendant pleads non est factum, the plaintiff will not be allowed to prove the loss at the trial, and must be nonsuited (1). In such a case, the plaintiff should move to put off the trial, or may withdraw the record, and amend the pleadings, stating the circumstances to excuse the profert (1). * 349

When a deed is produced in evidence, the next step is to prove it duly executed. In a few cases, however, proof of execution will not be necessary; as, Proof of execution.

First, If the deed is thirty years old, it may be admitted in evidence without any proof of its execution; and the same rule applies generally to deeds concerning lands (*a*), to bonds (2), receipts (3), and all ancient writings. Some account, however, says Mr. Justice Buller, ought to be given of the place, where the deed was found (4); and in another book it is said, that "ancient writings, which are proved to have been found among deeds of evidences of land, may be given in evidence, although the execution cannot be proved; for it is hard to prove ancient things, and the Exceptions. 1. Deeds 30 years old.

(6) Totty v. Nesbitt, 3 T. R. 153. n. (c).

(1) Smith and others v. Woodward, 4 East 585.

(2) Governor of Chelsea Waterworks v. Cowper, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 275.

(3) Fry v. Wood, 11 G. 2. K. B. 1 Selw. N. P. 492.

(4) Bull. N. P. 255.

(*a*) That is, provided the possession has been according to the provisions of the deed. *Bull. N. P.* 255, 256. *Jackson* d. *Burhans* v. *Blanshan*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 292. *Roberts* v. *Stanton*, 2 *Mun.* 129. *Thompson* v. *Bullock*, 1 *Bay* 364. In *Thomas's Lessee* v. *Horlocker*, a deed bearing date 63 years ago, was admitted in evidence without proof of the execution, although possession had not attended it. 1 *Dall.* 14. A power of attorney contained in an ancient deed, and necessary to give it full effect, will equally be presumed to have been duly executed. *Doe* d. *Clinton & others* v. *Phelps*, 9 *Johns. Rep.* 169. *Doe* d. *Clinton & others* v. *Campbell*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 475.

finding them in such a place is a presumption, that they were honestly and fairly obtained and preserved for use, and are free from suspicion of dishonesty (5).

This observation, on the necessity of showing where the deed was found, seems to apply more particularly to those cases where the character and authenticity of old writings depend in some degree on the nature of the place or custody in which they have been kept. This is the case with terriers, ecclesiastical surveys, court rolls, and other muni-
* 350 *ments of manors, which ought to be produced each from its proper repository; and if they have been regularly preserved, it will not be necessary, after a certain lapse of time, to prove them genuine. For the same reason, old grants to abbeys have been rejected as evidence of private rights, because the possession of them did not appear to be connected with any persons who had an interest in the estate (1). But, in common cases, where the written instrument itself purports to belong to the party who produces it in evidence, it will be admitted without proof of the execution, and without showing where it has been kept, provided it is of sufficient age, and in other respects admissible evidence against the opposite party. On a question of settlement, therefore, where the respondents produced a certificate, more than thirty years old, which had been granted to their parish by the appellant parish, the court of King's Bench held, that the mere production of it was sufficient, and that the respondents were not obliged to show, that the certificate had been kept in the parish chest (2). It would be sufficient, if the certificate were to be produced by a rated inhabitant of the parish (3). So, in an action for a false return to a mandamus, a corporator may produce the muniments of the corporation (4).

If there is any blemish in the deed by rasure or inter-

(5) Vin. Ab. tit. Evidence, (A. b. 5), cited 7 East 231. And see Forbes, Administrator of Henchett, v. Wall, cited by Ld. Kenyon, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 278.

(1) See ante, p. 317.

(2) R. v. Ryton, 5 T. R. 259.

(3) R. v. Netherthong, 2 Maule & Selw. 337; previous to the late act of parliament, which makes rated inhabitants competent in such a case.

(4) 2 Maule & Selw. 338.

lineation (*a*), the deed ought to be proved though above thirty years old (5), and the blemish satisfactorily explained. In such a case, the jury would have to try, whether the rasure or interlineation was before or after the delivery of the deed; for, if the rasure was before that time, the deed is still valid and binding; it is only after the delivery, that a rasure or interlineation can affect a deed, and, even then, they are in some cases immaterial. Now, to ascertain the time of delivery, the first and best evidence to be resorted *to, is the testimony of a subscribing witness, if * 351
any can be produced; or, if there is no subscribing witness, other persons may be called, who were present when the deed was delivered; or, if no person was present, the time of delivery will be reckoned from the date of the deed; and the fact, of the rasure being after the delivery, may be proved either by a subscribing witness, or by any person who saw the rasure made.

The rule, that deeds of thirty years standing prove themselves, is so well established, that even if a subscribing witness were alive, and in a state to be produced, it has been thought unnecessary to call him for proving the execution. Lord Kenyon is reported to have said (1), that he remembered a case before Mr. Justice Yates, in which, a deed of that age being produced in evidence, it appeared that the subscribing witness was then actually in court, but he declared he would not break in upon a rule of evidence so well established, (by requiring the subscribing witness to be called,) and admitted the deed without further proof. But in the case of Rees v. Mansel (2), Mr. Baron Perrott held, that, although a deed may be read in evidence on account of its antiquity, yet, if on the other side it is shown that one of the witnesses is alive, he must be produced, or the

(5) Gilb. Ev. 89. Bull. N. P. 255.

(1) March v. Colnett, 2 Esp. N. P. C. 665.

(2) Selw. N. P. 492.

(*a*) Vide *Roberts* v. *Stanton*, 2 *Mun.* 129.

deed must be rejected; and he cited a case where a deed was produced in the King's Bench, and it appeared that Sir Joseph Jekyll was a subscribing witness, upon which the court said, they knew he was alive, and that if he did not come to prove it, the plaintiff must be nonsuited. It was then mentioned to have been ruled by Mr. Justice Yates, that, for the sake of practice, the witness should not be allowed to prove an old deed, even if he attended for that purpose; but Mr. B. Perrott retained his opinion; "An old deed (he said) is admitted only on a presumption, that the witnesses are dead, but when the contrary is made to
* 352 *appear, they must be called." If, indeed, the rule is founded on the presumption of the attesting witness's death, then it seems to follow, that, where that presumption is contradicted by the fact of his being still alive, the execution of the deed ought to be regularly proved, as in ordinary cases. But if courts of law have adopted the rule, not on the presumption of a fact, (which would be for the consideration of the jury rather than of the court,) but as a general maxim of law, on account of the great difficulty of proving execution after an interval of many years, and have therefore fixed a limit, beyond which the proof of execution will not be required, there appears to be no inconsistency in acting generally upon this principle, though in a particular case the subscribing witness may be proved to be alive, at the same time leaving it to the opposite side to dispute the regularity of the execution by calling him or any other witness.

2. Deeds enrolled.

Secondly, Deeds enrolled have been admitted without proof of execution (1). On this subject, Ch. B. Gilbert makes the following distinctions: "Where a deed needs enrolment," (as deeds of bargain and sale, by statute 27 Hen. VIII. c. 16.) "there the enrolment is the sign of the lawful execution of such deed, and the officer, appointed to authenticate such deeds by enrolment, is also empowered to take care of the fairness and legality of such

(1) Com. Dig. tit. Evidence, (B. 2), citing 1 Salk. 281.

deeds, and therefore a copy of such enrolment must be sufficient; for when the law has appointed them to be made public acts, the copy of such public acts shall be a sufficient attestation (2). But where a deed needs no enrolment, there, though it be enrolled, the inspeximus of such enrolment is not evidence, because, since the officer has no authority to enrol them, such enrolment cannot make them public acts, and consequently cannot entitle the copy of them to be given in evidence (*a*); for then, if the *deed were doubtful, it were but to enrol it, and bring the * 353
copy or inspeximus in evidence, and thereby avoid producing a deed that was any way suspicious (1)."

Mr. Justice Buller, after citing the rule from Chief Baron Gilbert, (that deeds of bargain and sale, enrolled and requiring enrolment, may be given in evidence without proof of the execution,) observes (2), that "the law "may well be doubted, notwithstanding that such deeds "of bargain and sale enrolled have frequently in trials at "nisi prius been given in evidence without being proved. "In support of this practice," he adds, "the case of "Smartle v. Williams (3) is much relied on; but that "case is wrong reported, for it appears from the report in "Levintz (4), that the acknowledgment was by the bar-"gainor, and so is stated in Salkeld's manuscript; be-"sides, it appears from both the books, that it was only a "term that passed, and consequently it was not an enrol-"ment within the statute." Mr. Justice Buller then cites a case from Styles' Reports (5), where Glyn, C. J. is reported to have said, that "if divers persons seal a deed, and but one of them acknowledge the deed, and the deed is thereupon enrolled, this is a good enrolment, and may be given in evidence at a trial, as a deed enrolled." "But

(2) Gilb. Ev. 86. 1 Keb. 117. 1 Salk. 280.
(1) Gilb. Ev. 86. 1 Keb. 117.
(2) Bull. N. P. 256.
(3) 1 Salk. 280.
(4) 3 Lev. 387. S. C.
(5) Thurle v. Madison, Styl. 462.

(*a*) Vide *Yarborough* v. *Beard*, *Tayl.* 25.

"it would be of very mischievous consequence," observes Mr. Just. Buller "to say, therefore, that a deed, enrolled "upon the acknowledgment of a bare trustee, might be "given in evidence against the real owner of the land, "without proving it executed by him. However, that has been the general opinion, and it seems fortified in "some degree by statute 10 Ann. c. 18. On the other "hand, it seems as absurd to say, that a release which has "been enrolled upon the acknowledgment of the releasor "shall not be admitted in evidence against him, without
* 354 "*being proved to be executed, because such release "does not need enrolment; and in fact such deeds have "often been admitted; and that was the case of Smartle "v. Williams; the deed there did not need enrolment, "yet being enrolled on the acknowledgment of the bargainor, it was read against him without being proved."

In the case of Smartle v. Williams, an examined copy of the enrolment of a deed of bargain and sale, by which a term of years was assigned, was offered in evidence without any proof of the bargainor's sealing and delivery. It was objected, that the copy of the deed enrolled was not evidence, because the interest assigned, being only a term, passed immediately, and the enrolment afterwards is no more than an enrolment of an obligation: but the court overruled this objection, and held, that "the acknowledgment of the deed by the lessor before the master in Chancery is good evidence against himself, and against all who claim under him (1)." So, in the case of Lady Holcroft v. Smith (2), a distinction was made between deeds of bargain and sale, (enrolled in pursuance of the statute of Henry VIII.), and other deeds enrolled, and it was held that a copy of a deed, enrolled for safe custody, would not be evidence otherwise than against the party, who sealed it, and all claiming under him. It does not appear from any of the authorities cited by the Chief Baron Gilbert, (excepting the case of Smartle v. Williams,) against what

(1) 3 Lev. 387. (2) 2 Freeman. 259. 1702. in Chanc.

party the copy of the enrolment was offered in evidence. If the enrolment had been on the acknowledgment of the bargainor, and offered as evidence against him, there cannot be a doubt of its being admissible.

With regard to a copy of the enrolment of a deed of bargain and sale, indented and enrolled in pursuance of the statute of Henry VIII., it is enacted by statute 10 Ann. *c. 18. s. 3. (1) "(for supplying a failure in pleading or deriving title to lands, &c. conveyed by such deeds of bargain and sale, where the original indentures are wanting,) that, where in pleading any such indenture shall be pleaded with a profert, the party so pleading may show forth and produce a copy of the enrolment; and such copy, examined with the enrolment, and signed by the proper officer having the custody of the enrolment, and proved upon oath to be a true copy, shall be of the same force and effect, as the indenture of bargain and sale would be, if produced." Before this statute, an enrolment of the deed could not have been pleaded; and though a deed had been exemplified under the great seal, yet it was necessary, at common law, to show forth the deed itself under seal, and not the exemplification (2). So, by the common law, a constat or inspeximus of the king's letters patent could not have been shown forth in court, but the letters patent themselves; but by statute 3 & 4 Ed. VI. c. 4. explained by stat. 13 Eliz. c. 6. "patentees, and persons claiming under them, may make title in pleading by showing forth an exemplification of the enrolment of the letters patent, as if the letters patent themselves were pleaded and shown forth;" and now they are to be given in evidence in the same manner as if they were pleaded (3).

*354

The rule concerning copies of enrolment, appears then to be, that a copy of the enrolment of a bargain and sale of freehold in lands, &c. is as good evidence as the original it-

(1) See also stat. 8 G. 2. c. 6. s. 22. (concerning deeds of bargain and sale of lands, in the North Riding of Yorkshire).

(2) Co. Lit. 225. b.

(3) Olive v. Gwyn, Hardr. 119.

self (4); but that a copy of the enrolment is not evidence of a bargain and sale of a chattel interest, or of the contents of any other deed enrolled for safe custody, except as against the party acknowledging the deed; and that against such party, and against all claiming under him, a copy of the enrolment of any deed is admissible in evidence (*a*).

* 356

3. Recital in a deed.

*Thirdly, the recital of a deed in another deed is evidence against the party who executed the reciting deed, or against any person claiming under him; and it will not be necessary, in such a case, to prove the execution of the recited deed; but proof of the execution of that which recites the other, will be sufficient; for, the party, and those claiming under him, are estopped by the recital (1). Thus, the recital of a lease in a deed of release is good evidence of such lease against the releasor, and those who

(4) See 14 East 231. and Hobhouse v. Hamilton, 1 Schoal. & Lefr. 207.

(1) Com. Dig. tit. Evidence, (B. 5). Fitzgerald v. Eustace, Gilb. Ev. 87.

(*a*) A statute of the state of New-York, sess. 36. c. 97. 1 R. L. 370. provides for the proving and recording of "every deed, conveyance or writing of or concerning any lands or real estate within the state;" and "any deed, conveyance or writing so acknowledged or proved, whether the same be recorded or not, or the record thereof, or a transcript of such record, certified by the Secretary of this state, or the clerk in whose office the same may be recorded or registered, under the seal of the court of Common Pleas of the county whereof he is clerk, may be read in evidence in any court of this state without further proof thereof." s. 5. 1 R. L. 370, 371. The acknowledgment and proof of deeds is merely for the purpose of recording them, and is not conclusive on the opposite party: the proof or acknowledgment is necessarily *ex parte;* and the party who is to be affected by the deed may question its validity, and the force and effect of the formal proof. *Jackson* d. *Hardenbergh and others* v. *Schoonmaker*, 4 *Johns. Rep.* 164. A paper purporting to be the record of a deed, which was not duly acknowledged, is a nullity, and not admissible in evidence either as a record or as a copy of a deed. *Doe* v. *Roe*, 1 *Johns. Cas.* 402.

claim under him (2). So where a party by his deed covenanted to lay out a sum of money in an annuity, and recited in the deed, that he had given a bond for the payment of the money, the recital was held to be sufficient evidence of the bond; for it was a confession by the obligor himself, and stronger than a verbal confession, being under his hand and seal (3). But a recital cannot operate as an estoppel against third persons who are neither parties nor privies to the reciting deed, and will not be evidence of the contents of the recited deed (4) (*a*). If the recital can be proved a correct copy, it is scarcely necessary to observe, that it will be admissible like any other examined copy, where secondary evidence of a deed can be admitted (*b*).

Lastly, a deed may be given in evidence, under a rule of court, without proof of execution; for the consent is conclusive, and the jury are to try only such facts as are in issue between the parties (5). 4. Deed produced by rule of court.

The cases above stated have been mentioned as exceptions; for the general rule is, that a deed cannot be given in evidence without proof of its execution (*c*). The execu- Proof of execution.

(2) Ford v. Grey, 1 Salk. 285.
(3) Marchioness of Annandale v. Harris, 2 P. Wms. 432. per Ld. Chan. King. See also Shelley v. Wright, Willes 11. and Com. Dig. tit. Estoppel, (A. 2.)
(4) 1 Salk. 285.
(5) 1 Siderf. 269. Gilb. Ev. 91.

(*a*) Vide 1 *Dall.* 67. A deed reciting another deed is evidence of the recited deed against the grantor, and all persons claiming by title derived from him subsequently; but it is not evidence against one who claims from him by title prior to the deed which contains the recital. *Penrose* v. *Griffith*, 4 *Binney* 231.

(*b*) It was held, in the case of an ancient deed, of the loss of which some evidence had been given, where the possession had not been contrary to the deed, and where the subscribing witnesses had been long dead, that a recital in another deed, (between other parties,) particularly if made by persons likely to know the fact, was evidence of the lost deed. *Garwood and others* v. *Dennis*, 4 *Binney* 314.

(*c*) Where a deed is offered in evidence to the jury, the court may either decide themselves that it is, or is not sufficiently prov-

tion of every instrument, that is attested, whether under seal or not, ought to be proved by a subscribing witness, if he can be produced, and is capable of being examined. * 357 The subscribing *witness alone is competent to prove the execution, because he may be able to state the time of the execution and some circumstances of the transaction, which may be material and unknown to other persons. On an indictment therefore against an apprentice for enlisting himself in the army, all the judges held, that the indenture of apprenticeship could not be proved by the master, but that it was necessary to call one of the subscribing witnesses (1) (*a*).

This rule is so strictly observed, that an acknowledgment of the obligor himself, admitting that he executed a bond (2) (*b*), and even an admission by the defendant in an answer to a bill filed against him for a discovery (3), will not dispense with the testimony of the subscribing witness; for though the party may acknowledge the bond, yet he may not know every circumstance attending the execution; "a fact may be known to the subscribing witness, not within the knowledge or recollection of the obligor, and he is entitled to avail himself of all the knowledge of the subscribing witness relative to the transaction (4)." The rule is precisely the same, whether the acknowledgment is of-

(1) R. v. Jones, East Pl. Cr. 822. 1 Leach. Cr. C. 208. S. C.

(2) Abbot v. Plumbe, 1 Dougl. 216. cited by Lawrence, J. 7 T. R. 267., and 2 East 187.

(3) Call v. Dunning, 4 East 53. See Bowles and another, Assignees of Jones, v. Longworthy, 5 T. R. 366.

(4) Per Le Blanc, J. 4 East 53.

---

ed, and admit or reject it accordingly, or they may refer the evidence to the jury, instructing them to disregard the deed, unless they are satisfied with the proof of its execution. *Commissioners of Berks County* v. *Ross*, 3 *Binney* 539. *M'Corkle* v. *Binns*, 5 *Binney* 348. Vide ante, 199. n. Where a deed is executed by virtue of a power of attorney, the power itself should be produced at the trial. *Johnson* v. *Mason*, 1 *Esp. Rep.* 89. *Yarborough* v. *Beard*, *Tayl.* 25.

(*a*) Vide *Willoughby* v. *Carleton*, 9 *Johns. Rep.* 136. *Davison's Lessee* v. *Bloomer*, 1 *Dall.* 123. *Pearl* v. *Allen*, 1 *Tyler* 4.

(*b*) Vide *Clements* v. *Eason*, 1 *Hayw.* 18.

fered as evidence against the party himself who made it (5), or against a third person (6); or, whether the deed is an existing instrument, or cancelled (7); or whether it is the foundation of the action, or comes in collaterally as part of the evidence in the cause (8). And this rule applies equally to all written instruments, which are attested (*a*). If, for example, an attested notice to quit has been given to the defendant, which it becomes necessary to prove in an action of ejectment, the execution must he proved by the attesting witness; and the circumstance, that the defendant read the notice and made no objection to it, cannot vary the case (9). *In all these cases, the attesting witness ought to be called to prove the execution, if he can be produced (*b*). If, indeed, a party to the suit agrees that the other party should act upon the instrument, as if the witness himself had been produced, that would dispense with his testimony (1). * 358

The subscribing witness is to prove the delivery of the deed, or, if the writing is not under seal, the hand-writing of the party (*c*). It is not absolutely necessary that the

(5) 4 East 53.
(6) 1 Doug. 216.
(7) Breton v. Cope, Peake N. P. C. 30.
(8) Manners q t. v. Postan, 4 Esp. N. P. C. 239.
(9) Doe dem. Sykes v. Durnford, 2 Maule & Selw. 62.
(1) Laing v. Raine, 2 Bos. & Pull. 85.

(*a*) As, to a promissory note. *January* v. *Goodman*, 1 *Dall.* 208. *Williams* v. *Davis*, 1 *Penn.* 177. So, to a receipt to which there is a subscribing witness. *Heckert* v. *Haine*, 6 *Binney* 16.

(*b*) The Sup. Court of New-York have taken a distinction between promissory notes to which there is a subscribing witness, and sealed instruments: the execution of the former may be proved by the confession of the maker; in the other case, the subscribing witness, if alive and within the state, must be produced. *Hall* v. *Phelps*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 451. *Fox & Paine* v. *Reil*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 477. An indorsement by the party to a deed, reciting one of the provisos in it, and expressly owning it to be his deed, is sufficient evidence of the execution. *Dillon* v. *Crawly*, 12 *Mod.* 500.

(*c*) A subscribing witness to a warrant of attorney swore, that from his minutes he found that he was present at a certain place,

witness should see the party sign or seal; if he sees him deliver it already signed and sealed, or merely sealed, as his own deed, it will be sufficient. Signing is not an essential part of a deed at common law; but it has been required in some cases by act of parliament, particularly by the statute of frauds (2), which expressly directs a signing in all grants of a freehold estate in lands, and in some other species of deeds; in which, therefore, signing seems as necessary as sealing.

Signing is sometimes made necessary to the execution of a power, by the express words of the deed which creates the power; and, in such cases, if attestation of the signature is required, an attestation merely of the sealing and delivery will not be sufficient. Thus, in the case of Wright v. Wakeford (3), where a power was created to be executed by trustees, with the consent of the cestui que trusts, testified by *writing under their hands and seals, attested by two or more credible witnesses,* but the attestation expressed only that the deed had been *sealed and delivered* by the cestui que trusts and the other parties in presence of the subscribing witnesses, the majority of the court of Common Pleas determined, that the power had not been duly executed; for the question is to be determined by the true construction of the terms of the attestation, and by that alone; and the word "sealed," according to its true acceptation and
* 359 *ordinary sense, cannot be considered as implying, that the parties, who put their seals to the instrument, put also their

(2) St. 29 C. 2. c. 3. s. 1.

(3) 4 Taunt. 214; Mansfield, Ch. J. dissenting. 17 Ves. 454. S. C.

---

on a certain day, being the day the warrant bore date, and that upon reference to the warrant he found his name in his own handwriting as an attesting witness, and that the seal appeared to be taken from an engraving he then and still had; and from all these circumstances *he was convinced that he was present,* and witnessed the execution of the instrument: this was held sufficient proof of the warrant to go to the jury. *Pigott* v. *Holloway,* 1 *Binney* 436. Et vide *Churchill* v. *Speight's Ex'rs,* 2 *Hayw.* 338.

hands to it, or signed it in the presence of the witnesses. It was further determined in this case (1), that a subsequent attestation, indorsed upon the instrument after the death of one of the cestui que trusts, and expressing that the parties had also *signed* in the presence of the subscribing witnesses, would not cure the original defect; on the ground that the attestation to constitute a due and effectual execution of the power, ought to make a part of the same transaction with the signing and sealing, such being the usual and common way of attesting the execution of all instruments requiring attestation. So in the late case of Doe on the demise of Mansfield v. Peach (2), where the power was directed to be executed "by any *deed or writing under the hands and seals* of the parties to be by them duly executed in the presence of, and *attested by, two or more witnesses*," and the attestation was only of the sealing and delivery, the court of King's Bench were of opinion, that, in order to make a due execution of the power in this case, the instrument ought to be made with all the forms required by the power, and that there must also be an attestation of its execution with all those forms; and with respect to the second point, which arose here as well as in the case of Wright v. Wakeford, the court said, it was not necessary to determine at what precise time the attestation must be made, but that the attestation subsequent to the death of one of the parties could not give to their act an operation which it never had during the lives of the parties. Where, however, the deed creating the power directed, not, that the instrument should be *attested* by witnesses, but, that the power should be executed by *any writing, to be signed and sealed in the presence of two or more witnesses*, and the deed in pursuance of the power was expressed to be executed in the presence of the witnesses, but the attestation applied only *to the sealing and delivery, the chancellor was of opinion, that in such a case it might be properly left to the jury to

* 360

(1) See also 17 Ves. 457.

(2) May 21, 1814, 2 Maule & Selw. 576.

presume, that the deed was signed, as it professed to be, in the presence of the witnesses, who attested the sealing and delivery (1).

In consequence of the decisions in the cases of Wright v. Wakeford and Mansfield v. Peach, (which might affect the titles of purchasers, in case the fact of signature were not expressed in the memorandum of attestation,) an act of parliament has been lately introduced (2), which enacts, "that every deed or other instrument *already made*, with the intention to exercise any power, authority, or trust, or to signify the consent or direction of any person, whose consent or direction may be necessary to be so signified, shall, if duly signed and executed, and in other respects duly attested, be, (from the date thereof, and so as to establish derivative titles,) of the same validity and effect, and proveable in the like manner as if a memorandum of attestation of signature, or of being under hand, had been subscribed by the witness; and the attestation, expressing the fact of sealing and delivering, without expressing the fact of signing or any other form of attestation, shall not exclude the proof or the presumption of signature."

Sealing is essential to a deed, but it is not material with what seal it is sealed; and any number of parties may use the same seal (3); or, one may seal for the rest with their consent, and the deed will be as binding as if every one had put his several seal (4). Thus, where one of two defendants, in the presence of the other and by his authority, executed a bill of sale for them both, the two defendants being partners in the transaction, but there was only one seal, and it did not appear whether the seal had been put twice upon the wax, the court of King's Bench held, that
* 361 *no particular mode of delivery was necessary; and that it was sufficient, if a party executing a deed, treated it as his own. The report adds, that the court relied principally on the circumstance, that the deed had been executed by

(1) M'Queen v. Farquhar, 11 Ves. 467. 17 Ves. 458.
(2) St. 54 G. 3. c. 168.
(3) Perkins, ch. 2. s. 134.
(4) 4 T. R. 314., and see (3).

one defendant for himself and the other, *in the presence of the other* (1). If a bond executed abroad, is declared upon in the usual form, as a deed made and sealed by the defendant, and the instrument on being produced appears not to have a seal, but instead of it a penmark of a particular kind, evidence is admissible to show, that it is the custom of the country to execute bonds in this manner (2) (*a*).

With regard to the delivery, no particular form or ceremony is necessary: it will be sufficient, if a party testifies his intention in any manner, whether by action or by word, to deliver or put it into the possession of the other party;

(1) Ball v. Dunsterville and another, 4 T. R. 313.

(2) Adam v. Kerr, 1 Bos. & Pull. 360.

(*a*) This was the decision of the judge at N. P. in the case of *Adam* v. *Kerr;* but the court of C. B. granted a rule to show cause, on the ground that evidence of the custom ought not to have been admitted; the rule however was afterwards discharged on a compromise between the parties: this case, then, can hardly be considered as warranting the position in the text: the reporter himself states the point with a *Quære*, and Kent, C. J. in *Warren* v. *Lynch*, 5 *Johns. Rep.* 239., in noticing this case, says that it had not altered the common law in Westminster Hall. The case of *Warren* v. *Lynch*, was an action of assumpsit on a promissory note executed in Virginia and payable in New-York, to the signature to which was added a scrawl enclosing the letters L. S.: it was objected on the part of the defendant that this was a sealed instrument and consequently that the form of action was improper. The court held that it was not a sealed instrument. The opinion of Kent, Ch. J. contains all the learning, both ancient and modern, on the subject of seals; and shows conclusively that the common law regards nothing as a seal, but wax or some other tenacious substance with an impression upon it. This note would not have been regarded as a specialty in Virginia, for although a scrawl may be equivalent to a seal, (*Jones & Temple* v. *Logwood*, 1 *Wash.* 42.,) yet to give it that effect there must be some expression in the body of the instrument to show that such was the intention of the parties. *Baird* v. *Blaigrove*, 1 *Wash.* 170. *Austin's Adm'x* v. *Whitlock's Ex'rs*, 1 *Mun.* 487. Vide *M'Dill's Lessee* v. *M'Dill*, 1 *Dall.* 63.

as, if a party threw the deed upon a table, with the intent that it may be taken by the other, who accordingly takes it; or, if a stranger deliver it with the assent of the party to the deed (3) (*b*). If the deed is made by a corporation, actual delivery is not required; and fixing the common seal, that is, the corporate seal, or any other used for the occasion (4), is tantamount to a delivery; but if the corporate body had given a letter of attorney to deliver, the deed is not theirs till delivery (5).

It has been before mentioned, that proof of delivery, without any proof of signing or sealing, will be sufficient evidence of execution; for the party by delivering a deed, purporting to be his own, adopts the seal and the signature. But, under particular circumstances, less evidence has been admitted to prove the execution. Thus, in a case where it appeared that the defendant, a few minutes after having executed the deed, brought it to the witness in an
* 362 *adjoining room, and desired him to attest it; another attesting witness was still in the room, where the deed had been executed; and it was further proved, that the witness was acquainted with the defendant's hand-writing, and that the defendant knew of his being acquainted with it, and that the defendant had acknowledged the instrument; but there was no proof of the act of delivery, and no reason was shown, why the other attesting witness could not be called to prove the delivery; in this case the court of Common Pleas was of opinion, that the whole might be

(3) Com. Dig. tit. Evidence, (A. 3), Co. Lit. 36. a. [Note 223.]

(4) Perkins, c. 2. s. 132.

(5) Co. Lit. 56. a. [Note 222.]

(*b*) Vide *Verplanck* v. *Sterry*, 12 *Johns. Rep.* 536. *Goodrich* v. *Walker*, 1 *Johns. Cas.* 250. Delivery of a deed to a third person for the use of the grantee, and without his knowledge becomes a valid delivery on the subsequent assent of the grantee, which has relation back to the original time of delivery. *Hatch* v. *Hatch*, 9 *Mass. Rep.* 307. *Belden* v. *Carter*, 4 *Day* 66. Possession by the grantee or his heirs, of an ancient deed is evidence of delivery. *Mallory* v. *Aspinwall*, 2 *Day* 280.

considered as one transaction, and that there was sufficient proof of the execution (1).

If a deed, or other written instrument, is attested, but none of the witnesses are capable of being examined, the course then is to prove an attesting witness's hand-writing; and this will be a sufficient proof of the execution; as, where the attesting witness is dead (*a*)—or blind (2)—or incompetent to give evidence, either from insanity (3), or from infamy of character (4), or from interest acquired after the execution of the deed (5) (*b*)—or where the subscribing witness is absent in a foreign country (6) (*c*), or out of the jurisdiction of the superior English courts, so as not to be amenable to their process (7) (*d*)—or where he cannot be (*e*) found after strict and diligent inquiry (8)†. The

(1) Parke v. Mears, 2 Bos. & Pull. 217. Powel v. Blacket, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 96. Grellier v. Neale, Peake N. P. C. 146.

(2) Wood v. Drury, 1 Ld. Raym. 734. per Holt, C. J.

(3) Vin. Abr. tit. Evidence, (T. b. 48.) pl. 12. Burnett v. Taylor, 9 Ves. jun. 381.

(4) Jones v. Mason, 2 Stra. 833.

(5) Goss v. Tracey, 1 P. Wms. 287. 289. Godfrey v. Norris, 1 Stra. 34. Swire v. Bell, 5 T. R. 371.

(6) Coghlan v. Williamson, 1 Doug. 93. Wallis v. Delancy, 7 T. R. 266. (c). Adam v. Kerr, 1 Bos. & Pull. 361.

(7) Prince v. Blackburn, 2 East 250. 1 Bos. & Pull. 361.

(8) Anon. case, 12 Mod. 607., per Holt, C. J. 7. T. R. 266. Cunliffe v. Sefton, 2 East 183. Crosby v. Percy, 1 Taunt. 365. Parker v. Hoskins, 2 Taunt. 223. Wardel v. Fermor, 2 Campb. 282.

† In the case of Cunliffe v. Sefton, (2 East 183.) it was proved that diligent inquiry had been made after one of the attesting witnesses to a bond,

---

(*a*) S. P. *Mott* v. *Doughty*, 1 *Johns. Cas.* 230.

(*b*) S. P. *Lessee of Hamilton* v. *Marsden*, 6 *Binney* 45. *Hamilton* v. *Williams*, 1 *Hayw.* 139. S. C. 2 *Hayw.* 101. Contra 2 *Hayw.* 329.

(*c*) S. P. *Sluby* v. *Champlin*, 4 *Johns. Rep.* 461. It was held that the absence of a subscribing witness was sufficiently accounted for, who had sailed for Spain, and had been driven back by stress of weather into an English port shortly before the trial, and expected to sail again immediately, but it was not known at the time of the trial, whether he had sailed again or not. *Ward* v. *Wells*, 1 *Taunt.* 461.

(*d*) Vide *Baker* v. *Blount*, 2 *Hayw.* 404.

(*e*) Vide *Jones* v. *Brinkley*, 1 *Hayw.* 20.

hand-writing *of the attesting witnesses is evidence of every thing on the face of the instrument; the sealing and delivery will be presumed (*a*); and it will not be neces-

at the residence of the obligor and obligee, without being able to obtain any intelligence of such a person; this was considered a sufficient ground for letting in proof of the hand-writing of the other attesting witness, who had since become interested as administratrix to the obligee, and was a plaintiff on the record. In the case of Crosby v. Percy, (1 Taunt. 365.), the court of Common Pleas held, that proof of the hand-writing of an attesting witness had been properly admitted, after proof that diligent inquiry had been made for him at his usual place of residence, where, in answer to the inquiry, information was received, as also from the father of the attesting witness, that he had absconded to avoid his creditors, and was not to be found. In the last case cited, of Wardel v. Fermor, (2 Campb. 282.), evidence of the hand-writing was admitted, on proof that twelve months before, a commission of bankrupt had been sued out against the subscribing witness, who had not appeared at the time fixed for his surrender. It is not possible, by any general rule, to ascertain precisely in what cases this proof of the subscribing witness's hand-writing will be admitted. Each case must depend upon its own peculiar circumstances. But in all cases it ought to be satisfactorily proved, that a reasonable, honest, and diligent inquiry has been made, without any evasion, and without any design to overlook the witness (*b*).

(*a*) Vide *Milward* v. *Temple*, 1 *Campb.* 375., in which in an action of debt on bond, the attesting witness's hand-writing being admitted, Ld. Ellenborough said, this might be taken as a presumptive admission of all he professed to attest, and would have been called to prove.

(*b*) Vide *Cook* v. *Woodrow*, 5 *Cranch* 13. Where the witnesses to a written contract were the sons of the defendant who executed it, and the plaintiff the day before the circuit, inquired of the defendant for the witnesses in order to subpœna them, and was falsely told by the defendant that they were gone on a journey; this was held not to be a sufficient reason for admitting other testimony of the hand-writing, the plaintiff not having used sufficient diligence to procure the witnesses. *Mills & another* v. *Twist*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 121.

sary to prove the hand-writing of the party (*c*) to the deed (1)†.

But, in cases, where there is no subscribing witness on the deed (*d*)—or, where the subscribing witness denies having any knowledge of the execution, (which is the same thing as if there were no witnesses at all (2),)—or, where the name of a fictitious person is inserted (3), or where the attesting witness was interested at the time of the execution of the deed, and continues so at the time of the trial (4) (*e*);—or, where the person, who has put his name as subscribing *witness, did so without the knowledge or consent of the parties (1);—or if, after diligent inquiry, nothing can be heard of the subscribing witness, so that he can neither be produced himself, nor his hand-writing proved (*a*); or if, at the time of the execution, he was of

* 364

(1) Prince v. Blackburn, 2 East 250. Adam v. Kerr, 1 Bos. & Pull. 360. Wallis v. Delancy, 7 T. R. 266. (c), Ld. Kenyon contra.

(2) Grellier v. Neale, Peake N. P. C. 145., ruled by Ld. Kenyon. Ley v. Ballard, 3 Esp. N. P. C. 173., by Ld. Kenyon. Fitzgerald v. Elsee, 2 Campb. 635., by Lawrence, J. Lemon v. Dean, ib. 636. n. by Le Blanc, J. (in the case of a promissory note). See also Blurton v. Toon, Skin. 639. Abbot v. Plumbe, 1 Doug. 216. Burrows v. Lock, 10 Ves. jun. 474—Phipps v. Parker, 1 Campb. 412. contra.

(3) Fasset v. Brown, Peake N. P. C. 23.

(4) Swire v. Bell, 5 T. R. 371.

(1) M'Craw v. Gentry, 3 Campb. 232. 4 Taunt. 220.

† In the case of a deed executed in the East Indies, and attested by a witness resident there, the stat. 26 G. 3. c. 57. s. 38. enacts, "that it shall be sufficient to prove the hand-writing of the party to the deed, and of the attesting witness, and that the witness is resident in the East Indies."

(*c*) Vide *Sluby* v. *Champlin*, 4 *Johns. Rep.* 461. In the following cases it was held that after proving the hand-writing of the witness, the hand-writing of the party should be proved. *Hopkins* v. *De Graffenreid*, 2 *Bay* 187. *Oliphant* v. *Taggart*, 1 *Bay* 255. *Irving* v. *Irving*, 2 *Hayw.* 27. Et vide 3 *Binney* 192.

(*d*) Vide *Ingram* v. *Hall*, 1 *Hayw.* 193.

(*e*) So, where the witness at the time of attestation was the wife of the obligor. *Nelius* v. *Brickell's Adm'rs*, 1 *Hayw.* 19.

(*a*) So, where the subscribing witness was dead and his hand-writing could not be proved. *Jones's Adm'rs* v. *Blount's Ex'rs*, 1 *Hayw.* 238., or if the subscribing witness is out of the jurisdiction of the court and no person to be found within its jurisdiction who can prove his hand-writing. *Clark* v. *Sanderson*, 3 *Binney* 192.

such an infamous character, as to make him incompetent to give evidence: in these cases, the execution may be proved, by proving the hand-writing of the party to the deed; or, by any person present at the execution, though he is not indorsed as witness (2); or, by proof of an admission of the party himself that he executed the deed (*b*). And proof of the party's hand-writing is a sufficient ground for presuming, that the deed was, as it purports to be, sealed and delivered (3) (*c*).

Proof of hand-writing.

The simplest and most obvious proof of hand-writing is the testimony of a witness, who saw the paper or signature actually written. But a great variety of cases must continually occur, where such a direct kind of evidence cannot possibly be procured. The writing may be secret, as must constantly happen in cases of a fraudulent or criminal nature; or, if any person was present, he may be dead or unknown. In this deficiency of positive proof, the best evidence, which the nature of the case admits, is the in-

(2) Com. Dig. tit. Evidence, (B.3). P. C. 145. Burrows v. Lock, 10
(3) Grellier v. Neale, Peake N. Ves. jun. 474.

(*b*) Vide *Call* v. *Dunning*, 4 *East's Rep.* 53. S. C. 5 *Esp. Rep.* 16.

(*c*) If a deed be attested by several subscribing witnesses, the execution may be proved by one of them; or if none of these witnesses can be produced, proof of the signature of one witness will be sufficient. *Ante*, 169. But before the hand-writing of one can be proved, it is, in general, necessary to account for the other subscribing witness not being produced, though the strictness of the rule may be dispensed with under particular circumstances, as in the case of an ancient deed, or where it was executed in a foreign country, when proof of the hand-writing of one attesting witness may be sufficient prima facie evidence to go to the jury. *Jackson* d. *Livingston & others* v. *Burton*, 11 *Johns. Rep.* 64. 7 *Term Rep.* 266. n. 1 *Bos. & Pull.* 360. Where there were three obligors and the action brought against one of them only, the other obligor was allowed to be a witness to prove the execution of the bond by the defendant. *Lockart* v. *Graham*, 1 *Str.* 35.

formation of witnesses acquainted with the supposed writer, who, from seeing him write, have acquired a knowledge of his hand-writing: for in every person's manner of writing there is a certain distinct prevailing character, which may be easily discovered by observation, and, when once known, may be afterwards applied as a standard to try any other specimens of writing, whose genuineness is disputed. A witness may therefore be asked, whether he has seen a particular person write, and afterwards, whether he believes the paper in dispute to be his hand-writing. This course of examination evidently involves two questions; first, *whether the supposed writer is the person of whom the witness speaks, and secondly, if he is the person, whether he wrote the paper in dispute. The first is a question of identity; the second a question of judgment, or a comparison in the mind of the witness between the general standard and the writing produced. * 365

This kind of evidence, like all probable evidence, admits of every possible degree from the lowest presumption to the highest moral certainty. It may be so weak as to be utterly unsafe to act upon, or so strong as in the mind of any reasonable man to produce conviction. The witness may have been in the constant habit of seeing him write, day after day, for years together, on common transactions, and in the course of important business; and what better means can he have of gaining the most accurate knowledge of his manner of writing? On the other hand, it may be found perhaps on inquiry, that he has seen him write only a few words, many years ago, or only once; or the specimens, which he saw, were perhaps slight and imperfect, made in a hurry, at distant intervals, or from some other cause were not the fair average specimens of his general style of writing, but deviations from the common form; in which cases, the impression on the mind of the witness will be faint and inaccurate. But whatever degree of weight his testimony may deserve, which is a question exclusively for the jury, it is an established rule, that if he

has seen the person write, he will be competent to speak to his hand-writing (1).

On the trial of Algernon Sidney, as appears from the printed report of that case (2), three witnesses were called to prove a paper to be his hand-writing: the first said he had seen the prisoner write the indorsement upon several
* 366 *bills of exchange, and that he believed the paper to have been written by him: this evidence was objected to as a comparison of hand-writing, but admitted: the second witness said, he had not seen the prisoner write more than once, but that he had seen his indorsement upon bills, and that the paper was very like it: the third witness said, he had seen several notes, which had come to him with the indorsement of the prisoner's name, and that he had paid them, and had never been called to account for mispayment: the whole of this evidence was received. The prisoner, in his defence, still insisted that nothing but the comparison of hand-writing had been offered as proof against him; and the act of parliament, which reversed his attainder, states the admission of this evidence as one of the grounds of the illegality of his conviction. That act recites, among other particulars, that "that there had not "been sufficient legal evidence of any treasons committed "by him, there being produced a paper found in his closet "supposed to be his hand-writing, which was not proved "by any one witness to have been written by him; *but the* "*jury was directed to believe it, by comparing it with other* "*writings of his* (1)." However, if the printed report of the trial is correct, something more than the mere comparison of hand-writing was laid before the jury; for, according to that report, the first witness had seen the prisoner write his name several times. And, though it may be objected to the testimony of the two last witnesses, that the indorsements, mentioned by them, were not sufficiently

(1) Lord Preston's case, 4 St. Tr. 446,7. Francia's case, 6 St. Tr. 70. Layer's case, 6 St. Tr. 275. R. v. Dr. Hensey, 1 Burr. 644. And see Eagleton and Coventry v. Kingston, 8. Ves. jun. 438. 474.

(2) 3 St. Tr. 802.

(1) Cited in Layer's case, 6 St. Tr. 279.

proved to have been written by the prisoner, that objection will not apply to the other witness, whose evidence was certainly admissible. The same kind of evidence was admitted in Lord Preston's case within a year after the reversal of Sidney's attainder, and has been since received in many cases of great authority (2).

*Another method of acquiring a knowledge of hand-writing is by means of a written correspondence. If a witness has received letters, purporting to have been written by a particular person, on subjects of business, or of such a nature as makes it probable, that they were written by the hand from which they profess to come, he may be admitted to speak to that person's hand-writing. The same questions occur here, as have been before mentioned in the case, where a witness speaks from having seen the person write; and in addition to these, one other question arises, concerning the identity of the person who wrote the letters; and the admissibility of the evidence must depend upon this, whether there is good reason to believe, that the specimens, from which the witness has derived his knowledge, were written by the supposed writer of the paper in question. If this point is clearly proved, the witness, who has received the letters, will frequently be able to give more satisfactory evidence than one who has seen the person in the act of writing; for the latter may have seen him write but seldom, or on occasions which were not likely to excite attention; while the other may have had frequent opportunities of re-perusing the letters, and the letters themselves, having been written on subjects of business, will probably have more consistency, and exhibit a fairer specimen of the general character of hand-writing. *367

The first reported case, in which the admissibility of this

(2) See also the case of De la Motte, 1781, in vol. 21 of Howell's New Coll. of St. Tr. 810. (*a*).

(*a*) Vide *Rex* v. *Tandy*, 2 *M'Nally* 409. *Rex* v. *Jackson*, & *Rex* v. *Shears*, *Id.* 416. 1 *Day's Esp. Rep.* 273. *a.* et seq.

kind of evidence appears to have been decided, is the case of Lord Ferrers v. Shirley, which is thus stated in Fitzgibbon's Reports (1). "Upon a feigned issue out of chancery, directed to be tried at bar, whether a deed, pretended to have been executed by the Earl Ferrers in the year 1683, was his deed or not, several witnesses were called to swear to the hand-writing of the subscribing witnesses then dead, and amongst others, one J. J., who would
* 368 *have sworn to the name of J. Cottington, whose name was on the deed as a witness, because he had seen several letters written by Cottington; thereupon he was asked whether he had ever seen Cottington write; to which he answered, that he never did, nor ever saw the person that wrote the said letters, but that his master, (to whom the letters were written for the rent of a part of the estate of the late Earl Ferrers, which his said master held,) informed him they were the letters of Cottington, the Lord Ferrers's steward, who was the person pretended to have attested the deed in question. It was hereupon objected to his testimony, because he could not say with any certainty, whether or not the writer of the letters was the same person that attested the deed; for Cottington, who was supposed to write the letters, might get some other person to write those very letters for him; and the counsel insisted, that in all cases, where a witness would swear to hand-writing, he must be able to say, that he saw such person write. The court rejected the witness, because he could not ascertain the identity of the person. But Lord Raymond said, "It was not necessary in all cases that the witness should have seen the person write, to whose hand he swears; for where there has been a fixed correspondence by letters, and that it can be made out that the party writing such letters is the same man that attested a deed, that will entitle a witness to swear to that person's hand, though he never saw him write." Page, J. said, "If a subscribing witness to a deed lives in the West Indies, whose hand-writing is to be proved in England, a witness here may swear to his hand, by having seen the

(1) P. 195.

letters of such person, written by him to his correspondent in England, because under the special circumstances of that case, there is no other way, or at least the difficulty will be great, to prove the hand-writing of such subscribing witness." But Lord Raymond differed, and said, "that these special circumstances could not vary the reason of the thing." It was further objected to the same witness, that he should produce the letters, that the court and the *jury might be able to judge of the resemblance between the hand-writing of the letters and that on the deed; but this was overruled by the court, "because the witness might well have acquired a knowledge of the character of Cottington's hand-writing, by having seen several letters written by him." The rule to be deduced from this case is, that a witness may be admitted to speak to a person's hand-writing, if he has seen letters which can be proved to have been written by him; but that this antecedent proof of the identity of the person is indispensably necessary; and further, that hearsay evidence of identity is totally inadmissible. The case, reported to have been put by Page, J., is not very clearly stated. If it is understood to mean, that where a subscribing witness resides abroad, slighter proof of his signature may be given than is necessary in other cases, it certainly cannot be supported; but if the meaning is, that his signature may be proved in the same manner as if he were dead, by a witness who has seen letters proved to be of his writing, the case is warranted by many later authorities, which have been already mentioned. And with regard to the last objection, namely, that the witness ought to produce the letters, that the jury might judge of the resemblance, it appears to have been made as a preliminary objection to the admissibility of his evidence, and was therefore properly overruled. But after the witness has been regularly admitted to give his evidence, it seems reasonable that the opposite party should be allowed not only to cross-examine as to the number and appearance of the writings which the witness professes to have seen, but also to call upon him

* 369

to produce the writings in court, that the jury may judge of the means which the witness had of forming his opinion.

Another authority, in support of the rule laid down in Lord Ferrers v. Shirley, is Layer's case (1), on a trial
* 370 *for high treason, where the witness, (who had received letters from the prisoner on business five years before, which he answered, and transacted the business according to the directions in the letters, and had been paid for it,) was allowed to speak to the hand-writing of a treasonable paper charged upon the prisoner; and, though the witness in this case had seen the prisoner write some years before the receipt of the letters, yet independent of that circumstance his evidence was adjudged to be admissible. If he had formed his judgment of the prisoner's hand-writing from these letters alone, "if the case had gone no further," said the Chief Justice, "nobody could have doubted but that, according to the usual course and rules of evidence, the paper ought to be read." With respect to the interval of time that has elapsed since the witness saw the prisoner write, or received letters from him, that is a circumstance not to exclude him from giving evidence, but to be left with all the other circumstances of the case to the consideration of the jury.

This rule of evidence appears not to have been settled at the time of the memorable trial of the seven bishops, who were tried for a libel in the fourth year of James II. In the course of that trial, a witness, called to prove the signature of one of the bishops, said he had received letters from him on business, and that he had done what the letters required, and that he believed the signature in question to be the bishop's hand-writing, but could not swear that those letters were written by him (1). This was the strongest evidence in the case, excepting the proof of the archbishop's signature, which was proved by one who had seen him write. But Mr. Justice Powell thought

(1) 6 St. Tr. 275. Gold v. Jones, 1 Black. Rep. 384. S. P.

(1) 4 St. Tr. 338.

it an objection to the evidence before mentioned, that the witness had never seen the bishop write, and that the receipt of the letters was not sufficient, unless he could also swear who had written them. A long and desultory *argument ensued on the admissibility of the paper in question, the counsel for the prosecution insisting, that the signatures of the bishops had been proved, and the counsel on the other side, that the proof was insufficient. Mr. Justice Powell said (1), "he thought the paper had "not been sufficiently proved to be subscribed by the "bishops. It is too slender a proof for such a case. I "grant you," he added, "in civil actions a slender proof "is sufficient to make out a man's hand, as by a letter to "a tradesman or a correspondent, or the like; but in cri-"minal causes, such as this, if such a proof is allowed, where is the safety of your life, or any man's life here?" The judges were equally divided in opinion, and the paper was not allowed to be read. Thus it appears, that at that time the rule of evidence, which has been mentioned, was not admitted in criminal cases, though even then it was acknowledged to be reasonable in cases of a civil nature. But this distinction is no longer made. If the rule is true in the one case, it must be equally true in the other; for the rules of evidence, which are the laws of truth, must be uniform and universal (*a*). * 371

(1) P. 345.

(*a*) In an action on a promissory note, the confidential clerk of the plaintiff was admitted to prove the hand-writing of the indorser from the knowledge which he had acquired from the correspondence between the plaintiff and indorser, although he had never seen the latter write. *Titford* v. *Knott*, 2 *Johns. Cas.* 211. Where the witnesses to a will were all dead, and one of them had signed the initials of his name as his mark, and the testator had also signed his mark, and the hand-writing of two of the witnesses was proved; and a witness at the trial in 1807, swore that he had seen the other witness make his mark in the year 1760, to a paper n his possession, and that from a comparison of the two marks,

Comparison of hand-writing.

In the cases which have been mentioned, the proof of hand-writing is founded on a knowledge of the general character. The witness is supposed to have formed a standard in his mind, and with that standard to compare the writing in question. But no other kind of comparison will be allowed. It is an established rule of evidence, that hand-writing cannot be proved by comparing the paper in dispute with any other papers acknowledged to be genuine. The reason usually assigned, is, that unless a jury can read, they would be unable to institute a comparison, or judge of the supposed resemblance (2); a reason, however, which appears to be too narrow for a rule of such general application. Another reason, for rejecting such a comparison, *372 *seems to be, that the writings intended as specimens to be compared with the disputed paper, would be brought together by a party to the suit, who is interested to select such writings only as may best serve his purpose, and they are

(2) Macferson v. Thoytes, Peake N. P. C. 20. Brookbard v. Woodley, do. n. (b).

---

and from the peculiar manner in which one of the initial letters was made, he believed the mark affixed to the will was made by the witness to it: this was held sufficient evidence of the execution of the will, to permit it to be read to the jury, when accompanied with evidence of a possession by the devisees under the will, and of the declaration of one of the other witnesses in his life time, as to the due attestation by all the witnesses. *Jackson* d. *Van Dusen & others* v. *Van Dusen*, 5 *Johns. Rep.* 144. Where the question was whether an alteration in a will was made by the original draughtsman or a stranger, witnesses were offered who were well acquainted with, and swore to the scribe's hand-writing, and who swore that certain deeds, then in their possession, which they produced to the jury, were the hand-writing of the scribe, and contained certain peculiarities observable in the will, and that they had frequently known the scribe to write in the same manner; the evidence was held admissible, and that it was not a mere comparison of hands. *Smith* v. *Fenner*, *Rep. C. C. U. S. First Circt.* 170.

not likely therefore to exhibit a fair specimen of the general character of hand-writing. It has been thought by some an inconsistency in the rules of evidence, to allow a witness to compare in his mind the disputed paper with the impression which a short and transient view of writings may have made upon his memory; yet, on the other hand, not to permit the jury to compare it with writings, proved to be authentic, present in court, and open for inspection. The only answer which occurs to this objection, is that before suggested, namely, that the writings, which are produced as specimens, having been selected by an interested party to serve a present purpose, are open to suspicion, and liable to the imputation of contrivance (*a*).

When the antiquity of a writing, purporting to bear a person's signature, makes it impossible for a witness to swear that he ever has seen the party write, it has been held sufficient, if the witness has become acquainted with his manner of signing his name, by inspecting other ancient writings which bear the same signature, provided those ancient writings have been treated and regularly preserved as authentic documents. Thus, where a parson's book was produced to prove a modus, the parson having been long dead, a witness who had examined the parish-books in which the same parson's name was written, was permitted to swear to the similitude of the hand-writing; "for it was the best evidence in the nature of the thing, for the parish-books were not in the plaintiff's power to produce (1)." Hence it may be inferred, that if the parish-

(1) Per Ld. Hardwicke in Chanc. Dec. 1746, cited in Bull. N. P. [236].

(*a*) In *Allesbrook* v. *Roach*, 1 *Esp. Rep.* 351. Lord Kenyon allowed the jury to examine papers admitted to be the party's hand-writing, and to compare them with the writing in question, and to draw their own conclusion. It has been held, in Connecticut, that comparison of the hand-writing of the party, is admissible evidence in a criminal prosecution; and, like all other evidence, to be left to the triers to weigh and consider. *State* v. *Brunson*, 1 *Root* 307.

books could have been produced, they might have been brought into court, and a comparison made between those signatures and the signature in question. And this infer-
* 373 *ence is supported by two late cases (1), in which a signature in an entry, purporting to have been made by a person long since deceased, was allowed to be compared with another signature of the same person in a deed of settlement, and this evidence by comparison was admitted, on the ground, that at such a distance of time no better evidence of the fact could be obtained*.

In a case, where the question was, whether a will had been forged, a clerk of the general post office, who had been regularly employed to inspect franks and detect forgeries, was admitted by the court of King's Bench, on a trial at bar, to speak to the general appearance of the hand-writing of the will, and to give his opinion, whether it was written in a natural or imitated character (2). The judges considered it entirely a question of art, which might be answered by a witness of skill and experience. The witness, however, in his examination, admitted that he had never detected an imitation of the hand-writing of an old person, who wrote with difficulty, and might be supposed frequently to stop; and that they judged principally by seeing, whether the letters were what they called *painted*, or

(1) Brune v. Rawlins, 7 East 282. n. (a), ruled by Le Blanc, J.; Morewood v. Wood, 14 East 328. S. P.

(2) Revet v. Braham, 4 T. R. 497.

---

* In an earlier case, before Mr. Justice Yates, this kind of evidence was rejected. The plaintiff in that case, in support of a modus, produced a paper containing a particular of tithes, and said to be the hand-writing of the deceased rector. In order to prove that this was the writing of the rector, whose name it bore, the plaintiff's counsel offered to produce several returns of births and burials in the parish, purporting to have been made and signed by the same rector; and on comparing the signature on the returns with that on the paper, the hand-writing, it was said, would appear to be by the same person. But Mr. Justice Yates rejected the evidence. Brookbard v. Woodley, Appendix to Vin. Ab. vol. iv. 267. Peake, N. P. C. 20. S. C.

passed over by the pen a second time, which might happen to any person from a failure of ink. In the same case, after the witness had proved that the will was not genuine, he was shown a paper admitted to have been written by a *person suspected of forging the will, and was then asked, whether in his opinion that paper and the will had been written by the same person. The question was objected to, but admitted by the court; yet this was evidently a mere comparison of hand-writing, and a sort of comparison the least of all to be trusted, as it was an attempt to trace a resemblance between two papers, which the writer would endeavour to make as unlike as possible. This subject was much discussed in the case of the King v. Cator (1), tried before Mr. Baron Hotham, from which case this distinction may properly be made, namely, that persons of skill may be called to ascertain whether hand-writing is genuine, or whether it was written at interrupted strokes, like the writing of a person attempting to imitate the hand of another; but that they cannot be asked, whether the same hand, which wrote another paper, wrote also the feigned paper.

* 374

Sect. II.

Of the Proof of Wills.

By the statute of frauds (2), "all devises of lands or tenements devisable by that statute, or by the statute of wills (3)*, or by force of any particular custom, are re-

(1) 4 Esp. N. P. C. 117. 145.
(2) St. 29 C. 2. c. 3. s. 5.
(3) St. 32 H. 8. c. 1., explained by St. 34 H. 8 c. 5.

* The statutes of the 32d and 34th of Henry VIII. gave the power of devising to such persons only as held by socage, and had an estate of inheritance in fee-simple. But copyholds, not being held by socage tenure, cannot be devised under these statutes, nor are they made devisable by any clause in the statute of frauds; and they are considered to be in their na-

*quired to be in writing, and signed by the party so devising the same, or by some other person in his presence, and by his express direction, and to be attested and subscribed in the presence of the said devisor by three or four credible witnesses, or else they shall be utterly void, and of no effect."

This clause describes the solemnities which ought to attend the execution, and particularly adverts to the character of the witnesses and the situation of the devisor at the moment when the act of attestation is performed. "That the statute had a main view to the quality of the witnesses," said Lord Camden in the case of Hindson v. Kersey, "will appear from this consideration, namely, that a will is the only instrument in it required to be attested by subscribing witnesses at the time of execution; while leases, marriage agreements, declarations, and assignments of trusts, were only required to be in writing and signed. These are transactions of health, and protected by valuable considerations, and antecedent treaties; but a will is often executed suddenly in a last sickness, and sometimes in the article of death; and the great question to be asked in such cases is, whether the testator was in his senses when he made the will? and consequently the time of the execution is the critical moment which requires guard and protection. What is the employment of the witnesses? It is to inspect and judge of the testator's sanity before they attest, and, if he is not capable, they ought to refuse

ture not properly the subject of a devise, for they do not pass by a will merely as a will, but by will and surrender taken together. The practice is to surrender to the use of the owner's last will, and on this surrender the will operates as a declaration of the use, and not as a devise of the land itself. A devise therefore of copyhold lands, or of customary lands which pass by surrender and admittance, does not require any attestation; nor will it require a signature, unless a signature is made necessary by the terms of the surrender to the use of the will. Wagstaff v. Wagstaff, 2 P. Wms. 258. Tuffnell v. Page, 2 Atk. 37. Carey v. Askew, 2 Bro. Ch. Rep. 58. Doe dem. Cook v. Danvers, 7 East 299. 322.

to attest (*a*). In other cases, the witnesses are passive, here they are active, and in truth the principal parties to the transaction. The testator is intrusted to their care (1) *." According to this *reasoning, the credibility or competency of the witnesses (for the term "credible" is to be construed in this passage as synonimous with "competent,") must be considered with reference to the time of attestation (*b*); so that, if one of three attesting witnesses would have been incompetent to give evidence at the time of his subscribing, (as from want of reason, or from conviction of some infamous offence (1),) the will is not duly executed within the statute of frauds. Upon this principle it was determined, soon after the passing of the statute, that a devisee could not attest a will under which he took an interest (2) (*c*). But considerable doubts were af- * 376

(1) Hindson v. Kersey, 4 Burn. Eccl. L. 88.

(1) Pendock v. Mackinder, Willes' Rep. 665.

(2) Hilliard v. Jennings, 1 Ld. Raym. 505. Com. Rep. 91. S. C.

* There has been a difference of opinion respecting the meaning of the term "credible," in the fifth section of the statute of frauds. Lord Mansfield thought it inaccurate, and that it had slipped into the statute as a word of course; and that the witnesses need not be competent, as that word is understood in law, at the time of the execution. "If all the witnesses," said Lord Mansfield, "swear that the testator did not execute, if they had at the time the worst characters, and had committed the most infamous actions, yet their attestation answers the necessary form, because the testator meant to comply with the law, and might not know them to be bad men. Objections to the sufficiency of the subscribing witnesses," he added, "should be left to be judged of, as cases arise, by general principles, by analogy to the law of witnesses in other instances, and by arguments drawn from the nature and fitness of the thing with regard to justice, convenience, and the intent of the statute." Wyndham v. Chetwynd, 1 Burr. 418, 419.

(*a*) The law, says the Sup. Court of Massachusetts, places the witnesses around the testator to try, judge and determine whether he is *compos* to execute the will. *Poorle & others* v. *Richardson*, 3 *Mass. Rep.* 330. acc. *Heywood* v. *Hazard*, 1 *Bay* 335.

(*b*) Vide *Amory* v. *Fellows*, 5 *Mass. Rep.* 219.

(*c*) Vide *Starr* v. *Starr*, 2 *Root* 303. *Dickson* v. *Bates*, 2 *Bay* 448.

terwards entertained, whether the competency of such an interested person might not be restored by a release, payment, or extinguishment of all his interest, so as to admit him to prove the execution (3) (*a*). In consequence of this difference of opinion, the legislature passed an act, which, (after reciting, that it had been doubted, who were to be deemed legal witnesses within the statute of frauds,) enacts (4), that "if any person shall attest the execution "of any will or codicil, (to whom any beneficial devise, "legacy, estate, interest, gift, or appointment affecting any "real or personal estate, except charges on land, &c. for "payment of debts, shall be given,) such devise, legacy, "&c. shall, so far only as concerns such person attesting
* 377 "the *execution, or any person claiming under him, be ut-"terly null and void; and such person shall be admitted "as a witness to the execution of such will or codicil, with-"in the intent of the said act, notwithstanding such devise, "legacy, &c. And in case any will or codicil shall be "charged with any debt, and any creditor, whose debt is "so charged, shall attest the execution of such will or "codicil, every such creditor, notwithstanding such charge, "shall be admitted as a witness to the execution of such "will or codicil, within the intent of the said act: Pro-"vided always, that the credit of every such witness so "attesting the execution of any will or codicil in any of "the cases within this act, and all circumstances relating "thereto, shall be subject to the consideration and deter-"mination of the court and the jury, before whom any "such witness shall be examined, or his testimony or at-"testation made use of, in like manner, as the credit of "witnesses in all other cases ought to be considered and

(3) See on this subject Anstey v. Dowsing, 2 Stra. 1253. Wyndham v. Chetwynd, 1 Burr. 414. Hindson v. Kersey, 4 Burn. Eccl. L. 88.

(4) St. 25 G. 2. c. 6. s. 1, 2. 6.

(*a*) Vide *Shaffer's lessee* v. *Corbett*, 3 *Harris and M'Henry* 513. *Dickson* v. *Bates*, 2 *Bay* 448. in which the question of competency was held to refer to the time of proving the will.

"determined (*a*)." It had been determined, long before this act, that an executor, who took nothing under the will, and had no interest in the surplus, was a competent witness to prove the will in a cause concerning the estate (1) (*b*).

The best proof of the contents of a will is the original will itself. An exemplification under the great seal is not evidence in an action of ejectment (2); nor is the probate of a will in the spiritual court any proof of a devise of real property (3), even where the original is lost (4), for that court has no power to grant a probate of such devises, or to authenticate them on its rolls. But, where the contents of a will are given in evidence, not to establish a devise, but merely for the purpose of proving a pedigree stated in the will, the rolls of the spiritual court, which has authority to enrol, have been thought admissible (5). And similar *evidence has been admitted, where a party to the suit has no right to the possession of the will, and could not produce the original. Thus, in an avowry for a rent-charge, where the avowant claimed under a will, which he could not * 378

(1) Anon. case, 1 Mod. 107.; and see Bettison v. Sir R. Bromley, 12 East 250. where the cases are collected; and supra, p. 40.

(2) Comberb. 46.

(3) See ante, p. 299.

(4) 1 Ld. Raym. 732. See St. Legar v. Adams, 1 Ld. Raym. 731; Skinner 174.

(5) See ante, p. 299.

(*a*) There is a similar statute in the state of New-York, sess. 36. c. 23. s. 12, 13. Under this act it has been held, that the devise is ab initio void, and consequently that no title can be derived from such devisee. *Jackson* d. *Denniston & others* v. *Denniston*, 4 *Johns. Rep.* 311. And if a husband be a subscribing witness, a devise or legacy to his wife is void, and so *vice versa*. *Jackson* d. *Cooder & others* v. *Woods*, 1 *Johns. Cas.* 163. *Jackson* d. *Beach & others* v. *Durland*, 2 *Johns. Cas.* 314.

(*b*) Vide *Hawley* v. *Brown*, 1 *Root* 494. The judge of the court of probate is a competent witness to the will. *M'Lean & wife* v. *Barnard*, 1 *Root* 462. 2 *Root* 332. The inhabitants of an incorporated society to whom property is devised for the support of a school are competent witnesses to attest the will. *Cornwell* v. *Isham*, 1 *Day* 35.

produce, as it belonged to the devisee of the land, the ordinary's register of the will and proof of former payments were held to be sufficient evidence against the plaintiff, who was the devisee of the land charged (1). In such a case, however, though the party cannot produce the will, he ought to give notice to the other party to produce it (2) (*a*).

The execution of a will is to be proved by the subscribing witnesses, if they are alive and can be produced. On a trial at common law, all the circumstances may be proved by a single witness; that is, upon the supposition, that there are two others who would be allowed to give the same testimony (3). If the opposite party disputes the regularity of the execution, he may call any of the other witnesses; but a devisee will not be obliged to call the rest, if one alone can prove all the requisites to establish the validity of the will. This is the rule in courts of common law. But on a bill filed in Chancery to establish a will, the rule is, that all the witnesses ought to be examined by the plaintiff. "It is the invariable practice in Chancery," said Lord Camden in the case of Hindson v. Kersey (4), "never to establish a will unless all the witnesses are examined, because the heir has a right to proof

(1) Anon. case, Rep. temp. Holt 298. Ante, p. 299.

(2) See ante, p. 336.

(3) Per Lee, C. J. in Anstey v. Dowsing, 2 Stra. 1254. Bull N. P. 264.

(4) 4 Burn. Eccl. L. 93. Ogle v. Cook, 1 Ves. 177.; Townsend v. Ives, 1 Wils. 216. S. P.

(*a*) Where the original will is shown to be lost, the next best evidence of its contents, as in the case of a deed, is admissible. *Jackson* d. *Donaldson* v. *Lucett*, 2 *Caines' Rep.* 363. A statute of the state of New-York, sess. 36. c. 23. s. 6. 1 R. L. 365. provides a mode of proving and recording wills in the Sup. Court, or a court of Common Pleas, and makes a transcript of the record certified by the clerk and sealed with the seal of the court as effectual in all cases as the original will. But such proof and record have been held not to be conclusive upon the heir, who may still impeach the validity of the will. *Jackson* d. *Woodhull & others* v. *Rumsey*, 3 *Johns. Cas.* 234.

of sanity from every one of those, whom the statute has placed about his ancestor."

The facts, to be proved by the subscribing witness, are that the devisor signed the will, or that another person signed in his presence, and by his express direction, and *that the witness and two others attested and subscribed in the presence of the devisor. * 379

Signing.

First, as to the signing by the testator, it is not material in what part of the will he makes his signature. The statute prescribes no particular form, and does not require him to subscribe, but simply to sign. It was therefore determined, in a case soon after the passing of the statute, that, if the testator writes his name at the beginning or on the side, the signing is sufficient (1). But where a will consisted of several distinct sheets, some of which the testator signed, and intended to sign the rest, but was not able, Lord Mansfield thought this was not a signing of the whole will (2). According to Freeman's report of the case of Lemayne v. Stanley (3), the court said, "It is not necessary to write, for some cannot write, and their mark is then a sufficient signing; others have their name on a stamp, and that is good enough." In that case also, three judges held, that if the testator had put his seal, that would have been of itself a sufficient signing within the statute; but Levinz, J. doubted, on the authority of a case in Rolle's Abridgment, where the court held, that an award, which by the submission ought to have been *signed* by the arbitrator, was not good in law, because it had been only *sealed*. Lord Raymond ruled in the case (4) at nisi prius, and Lord Holt is also reported to have said (5), that sealing was a signing within the statute. But later authorities appear to have considerably shaken this doc-

(1) Lemayne v. Stanley, 3 Lev. 1. Hilton v. King, 3 Lev. 86. 9 Ves. jun. 248.

(2) Right dem. Cater v. Price, 1 Doug. 241.

(3) P. 538. See also Hindson v. Kersey, 4 Burn. Eccl. L. 92. S. P. per Pratt, C. J.

(4) Warneford v. Warneford, 2 Stra. 764.

(5) Lee v. Libb, 1 Show. 68.

trine (6); and now the established rule seems to be, that sealing without signing is not a sufficient execution of the will. A bare sealing certainly cannot answer the
* 380 *purposes which the legislature had in view; it cannot identify the instrument, nor does it bear, like writing, any peculiar character. "The statute," said Lord Hardwicke, in one of the cases upon this subject (1), "by requiring the will to be signed, undoubtedly meant some evidence to arise from the hand-writing; then, how can it be said, that putting a seal to it would be a sufficient signing; for any one may put a seal; no particular evidence arises from sealing; common seals are alike; no certainty or guard arises from thence."

In a late case, where it appeared that the testator was blind, the Court of Common Pleas determined that it was not necessary to read over the will, previous to the execution, in the presence of the attesting witness (2). "The statute of frauds," said Mr. Justice Heath on that occasion, "only requires that the testator shall execute the will in the presence of the attesting witnesses, and, in ordinary cases, when that is done, all is done that is necessary to be done. In the case of a blind man, stronger evidence would be required than the mere attestation of signature, but in this case there was that stronger evidence, which the peculiarity of the case seems to call for. In the course of the argument sufficient attention has not been paid to the distinction between what shall be deemed a literal compliance with the provisions of the statute, and what sufficient proof to rebut any imputation of fraud. The question of fraud is for the jury entirely, and here they found the will to be a valid will."

Attestation. The subscribing witnesses are to attest the signing; but the statute does not direct that they shall see the testator sign, or that he should sign in their presence. It requires

(6) Smith v. Evans, 1 Wils. 313., by Parker, C. B. and the two other Barons present: Grayson v. Atkinson, by Lord Hardwicke, 2 Ves. 459: Ellis v. Smith, 1 Ves. jun. 11., by Parker, C. B., Willes, C. J., and Sir J. Strange. See also 17 Ves. 458.

(1) 2 Ves. 459.

(2) Longchamp v. Fish, 2 New Rep. 415.

only an attestation of the signing. Now, at the time of making that act of parliament, and ever since, if a bond or deed had been signed by the party, who afterwards ac- *knowledged it to be his hand-writing before witnesses, * 381
that was always considered to be evidence of the signing by the person executing, and a sufficient attestation by the subscribing witnesses (1); and the rule is precisely the same, where a note or declaration of trust, or any other instrument which requires a bare signing, is acknowledged before witnesses. From analogy to these cases, it has been determined in the case of wills, that the subscribing witnesses need not see the act of signing, but that it will be sufficient, if the testator has acknowledged to them, either to each separately or to all at the same time, that the will is his, or that the signature is his hand-writing (2). And the subscribing witnesses need not express in their attestation, that they subscribed their names in the presence of the testator; but whether they did so subscribe, is a question for the consideration of the jury, to be determined upon the evidence (3).

The statute requires the witnesses to attest the signing and to subscribe, but does not direct that they shall be all present at the same time: and although an attestation and subscription by all the witnesses at the same time would be the best security against fraud and imposition, by making each a check upon the other, yet in the interpretation of the statute courts of law early determined, and it is now an established rule of property, that the witnesses may subscribe at several times (4). An attestation by a

(1) 2 Ves. 457.

(2) Stonehouse v. Evelyn, 3 P. Wms. 253. Grayson v. Atkinson, 2 Ves. 454. Ellis v. Smith, 1 Ves. jun. 11. Addy v. Grix, 8 Ves. jun. 504. Westbeech v. Kennedy, 1 Ves. & Beam. 362.

(3) Brice v. Smith, Willes' Rep. 1. 4 Taunt. 217.

(4) Cook v. Parsons, Prec. in Chan. 185. Jones v. Lake, 2 Atk. 177., in not. S. P., admitted in 2 Ves. 458., and in 1 Ves. jun. 14.

mark has been adjudged to be a sufficient subscription within the meaning of the statute (5) (*a*).

It is not necessary that the testator should declare the instrument executed by him, to be his will, or that the
* 382 *witnesses should attest every page, or that every page should be particularly shown to them (1). The whole will, however, ought to be present at the time of attestation; for if a person makes a will on several pieces of paper, and there are three witnesses to the last paper, and none of them ever saw the will, this is not a sufficient execution (2). But unless there is positive proof that the entire will was not in the room, the question, whether it was so or not, is a question of fact, to be left with all the particular circumstances of the case to the consideration of the jury (3).

The witnesses are to attest and subscribe in the presence of the testator; and as the object of this provision was to guard against fraud, and prevent the substitution of a false will in the place of the true one, the obvious meaning of the statute must be, that the testator should be in such a state of mind, and in such a situation, as to be capable of seeing the witnesses in the act of subscribing. It will not be a good execution, if the testator was in a state of insensibility (4), or if it was impossible for him to see the witnesses subscribe. "It is enough if the testator might see, it is not necessary, that he should actually see them signing; for at that rate if a man should turn his head back, or look off, that would vitiate the will (5)." But if the jury find the fact, that the testator might have seen what was passing at the time of the subscribing, then it will be presumed in favour of the attestation, that the testator actually saw what he might have seen. In one

(5) Harrison v. Harrison, 8 Ves. jun. 185. Addy v. Grix, ib. 504.
(1) Bond v. Seawell, 3 Burr. 1773.
(2) Per Cur. in Lea v. Libb, 3 Mod. 262. 1 Eq. Cas. Ab. 403. S. P.
(3) Bond v. Seawell, 3 Burr. 1773.
(4) Cater v. Price, 1 Doug. 241.
(5) Per Cur. in Shires v. Glascock, 2 Salk. 687.

(*a*) Vide ante, 371. n.

case, the testator was sick in bed, and the witnesses withdrew into a gallery, and there subscribed it, between which gallery and the bed-chamber, (where the testator lay,) there was a lobby with glass doors, and part of the glass was broken (6); in another case, the testator lay in bed in *one room, and the witnesses went through a small passage into another room, and there set their names at a table in the middle of the room, and opposite to the door, and both that and the door of the testator's room were open (1); in a third case, the testatrix sat in her carriage opposite the window of her attorney's office, in which office the witnesses subscribed their names (2): in all these cases, (and in others, which might be mentioned to the same effect, differing only in their peculiar circumstances,) the execution was held to be sufficient, the material fact being proved, that the testator might have seen the attestation, if he had chosen to look.

* 383

If one of the subscribing witnesses can prove the execution, (as, that the testator signed in the presence of himself and two other witnesses, or that he acknowledged his signing to each of them, and that each of the witnesses subscribed in his presence,) this will be a sufficient proof of the will without calling the others. But if the witness, who is called, can only prove his own share in the transaction, as must happen, where the testator acknowledged his signing to the witnesses separately, the other witnesses ought in that case to be called. If they are dead, or insane, their hand-writing, and the hand-writing of the testator ought to be proved; it will then be a question for the jury, whether under the circumstances of the case it is probable, that all the formalities of the statute were regularly observed (3). The clause of attestation generally expresses, that the witnesses subscribed in the presence of

(6) Sir G. Sheers's case, cited Carth. 81.

(1) Davy and another v. Smith, 3 Salk. 395.

(2) Casson v. Dade, 1 Brown Ch. C. 99. See also Doe dem. Wright and others v. Manifold, 1 Maule & Selw. 294.

(3) Hands v. James, 2 Comyns' Rep. 530. Croft v. Pawlet, 2 Stra. 1109. Brice v. Smith, Willes' Rep. 1. S. P.

the testator; but such a statement is not absolutely necessary; and though it is entirely omitted, the omission will not conclude the jury from finding that the will was so subscribed. In the case of Croft v. Pawlet (3), the attestation
* 384 *was, that the will had been signed, sealed, published, and declared as his last will, in the presence of the subscribing witnesses; the witnesses being dead, and their signatures proved in the common way, it was objected, that this was not an execution according to the statute of frauds; for the signatures of the witnesses could only stand as to the facts to which they had subscribed, and signing in the presence of the testator was not one; but the Court were of opinion, that this was a matter of evidence to be left to the jury, and they gave a verdict in favour of the will.

If a subscribing witness is abroad, who ought to be called if he could be produced, his hand-writing may be proved in the case of a will, as in cases on the execution of a deed (*a*). And the rule appears to be the same in courts of equity. Thus, where a question arose, whether it was necessary to send out a commission to examine one of the witnesses, who was in Jamaica, Lord Alvanley, then Master of the Rolls, held that it was not necessary to have his examination, but that the case was the same as if the witness were dead (1): the heir at law, he observed, did not make a point of it, but submitted it to the court; and he cited a case, where it was thought not only unnecessary, but very dangerous to send the will abroad. And in another case, where it was objected that one of the witnesses was abroad, Lord Chancellor Thurlow said, he doubted whether the rule had ever been laid down so largely, as that the will could not be proved without

(3) Hands v. James, 2 Comyns' Rep. 530. Croft v. Pawlett, 2 Stra. 1109. Brice v. Smith, Willes' Rep. 1. S. P.

(1) Ld. Carrington v. Payne, 5 Ves. jun. 411.

(*a*) Vide *Hopkins* v. *De Graffenreid*, 2 *Bay* 187.

examining all the witnesses, although that had been the practice (2).

If a subscribing witness should deny the execution of the will, he may be contradicted, as to that fact, by another subscribing witness; and even if they all swear that the will was not duly executed, the devisee would be *allowed to go into circumstantial evidence to prove the due execution (1). If one of the subscribing witnesses impeach the validity of the will, on the ground of fraud, and accuse other witnesses, who are dead, of being accomplices in the fraud, the devisee may give evidence of their general good character (2). * 385

When the subscribing witnesses are dead, and no proof of their hand-writing can be obtained, as must frequently happen in the case of old wills, it will be sufficient to prove the signature of the testator alone. In a case (3), where the hand-writing of two subscribing witnesses was proved, and no account could be given of the third, the will being above thirty years old and the testator having been dead for twenty years, an objection was made to the proof of the will; but the Master of the Rolls said, he could not see any distinction in this respect between a will and a deed, except that the former, not having effect till the death, wants a kind of authentication, which the other has; that is, from the nature of the subject; but in this case, he added, I think the proof sufficient; for in a late case in the

(2) Powell v. Cleaver, 2 Brown, Ch. C. 504. See Grayson v. Atkinson, 2 Ves. 460.

(1) Austin v. Willes, Bull. N. P. 264. Pike v. Badmering, cited 2 Stra. 1096. Lowe v. Joliffe, 1 Black. Rep. 365.

(2) Vide supra, p. 213.

(3) M'Kenire v. Fraser, 9 Ves. jun. 5*.

* In Calthorpe v. Gough and others, (4 T. R. 707. n. (a), 709. n. (†), a will thirty years old was not proved by witnesses, and it was said at the bar, that proof was not necessary on account of the age of the will; and in support of this a case of Mackery v. Newbolt was cited, in which Sir Lloyd Kenyon, then Master of the Rolls, decided, that a will above thirty years old should be read without proof, although the testator had died very recently. That point, however, was not decided in the case of Calthorpe v. Gough, because the plaintiff, the heir at law, admitted the will, and claimed under it.

court of King's Bench, Cunliffe v. Sefton (4), an inquiry of the same kind was held sufficient. The Master of the Rolls therefore held, that the execution of the will had been sufficiently proved (*a*).

* 386

*CHAP. IX.

Of stamping, as a Requisite of Written Instruments.

A WRITTEN instrument, which requires a stamp, cannot be admitted in evidence, unless it be duly stamped; and no parol evidence will be received of its contents. If, therefore, the instrument produced is the only legal proof of the transaction, and that cannot be admitted for want of a proper stamp, the transaction cannot be proved at all (1); as, in an action for use and occupation, if it appears that the defendant held under a written agreement, which for want of a stamp cannot be received, the plaintiff will not be allowed to go into general evidence; for the agreement

(4) Vid. sup. p. 362.
(1) R. v. St. Paul's, Bedford, 6 T. R. 452. Hodges v. Drakeford, 1 New Rep. 271.

(*a*) An ancient will, with thirty years possession, in conformity to the provisions of it, since the death of the testator, like an ancient deed, proves itself: the period must be computed from the death of the testator, not from the date of the will. *Jackson* d. *Burhans* v. *Blanshan*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 292. *Shaller & another* v. *Brand*, 6 *Binney* 435. A will upwards of 80 years old, was admitted in evidence without proof of execution, though actual possession had not accompanied it, the premises having, until 30 years after the date of the will, never been in the actual possession of any one, when an adverse possession commenced; there being, however, circumstances shown to raise a presumption of the existence and genuineness of the will. *Jackson* d. *Lewis and others* v. *Laroway*, 3 *Johns. Cas.* 283. Vide ante, 371. n.

is the best evidence of the nature of the occupation (2). But it may happen, in a variety of cases, that the transaction is capable of being proved by other evidence besides the written instrument; and the objection arising from the stamp acts may be avoided by resorting to that other species of proof. Thus, although a receipt for the payment of a bill, on unstamped paper is not admissible in evidence, yet the fact of payment may be proved by a witness who saw the money paid; and even such an unstamped receipt may be shown to the witness as a memorandum to refresh his memory (3). So in an action on a promissory note, though the plaintiff cannot give the note in evidence, unless it is duly stamped, yet he will not be precluded from recovering on one of the general counts of the declaration, if he can prove an admission of the original debt, or give other evidence of a consideration received by the defendant (4). And so, when a party to *the suit admits on the record that, which, if not admitted, the other party must regularly prove, it cannot be necessary to produce that evidence, which would otherwise be required. As, where an action is brought upon an agreement, which ought to be stamped, and the form of the pleading is such as to make it unnecessary at the trial to produce the instrument, (as, if it is admitted on the record, and the trial is upon issues collateral to the existence of the agreement,) a court of law will not examine whether the instrument is legally available with reference to the stamp acts (1). So, where a plaintiff filed a bill in Chancery for the specific performance of an agreement contained in a correspondence between him and the defendant, and the answer of the defendant admitted the letters, insisting only, that they did not amount to an agreement, the Court held that such an admission dispensed with

* 387

(2) Brewer v. Palmer, 3 Esp. N. P. C. 213. Doe dem. St. John v. Hore, 2 Esp. N. P. C. 724.

(3) Rambert v. Cohen, 4 Esp. N. P. C. 213. Jacob v. Lindsay, 1 East 460.

(4) Farr v. Price, 1 East 57. Alves v. Hodgson, 7 T. R. 243. Tyte v. Jones, 1 East 58. n. (*a*). Brown v. Watts, 1 Taunt. 353. Wade v. Beasley, 4 Esp. N. P. C. 7.

(1) Per Ld. Eldon, Ch., 11 Ves. 596.

the necessity of producing the letters, and that no objection could be taken to the agreement for the want of a stamp (2).

Written agreements and other instruments, made in a foreign country, are not admissible in evidence in any of our courts, unless duly stamped by the laws of that country; if they are not obligatory abroad, they cannot be enforced here. As, where a promissory note had been made in Jamaica, but not stamped as it ought to have been by the laws of the island, the court of King's Bench held that a party could not recover here upon the note (3). The party who takes this objection to the validity of the instrument, will have to show, that a stamp was necessary by the law of the country; and for this purpose an authenticated copy of the law ought to be produced. If a person resident abroad desire his correspondent in England to fill up a bill of exchange, and return it to him to be signed, and he afterwards signs it abroad, the bill does not
* 388 *require to be stamped, as if it had been drawn in this country; and the rule is precisely the same, whether he signs his name as drawer, before or after he sends it over to this country to be filled up by his correspondent (1). In the case of Snaith v. Mingay (2), which was an action by an indorsee against the indorser, a person resident in Ireland subscribed his name in the character of drawer, and afterwards as first indorser, on a paper which was properly stamped according to the revenue laws of Ireland, and had every mark to designate it as a bill of exchange; he then sent it over to this country with authority to his correspondent to insert the day of the date, the sum, and the name of the drawee; and it did not appear that there was any intention of evading the stamp laws, or any imputation of fraud in the transaction: under these circumstances the court of King's Bench were of opinion,

(2) Huddleston v. Briscoe, 11 Ves. jun. 583.

(3) Alves v. Hodgson, 7 T. R. 241. Clegg v. Levy, 3 Campb. 166. S. P.

(1) 1 Maule & Selw. 94.

(2) Ibid. 87.

that the bill was an incipient bill in Ireland, though it was completed here, and that, after it had been completed, it was to be considered as a bill of exchange from the time of its being signed by the drawer; and consequently that an English stamp was not necessary.

It is not sufficient that the stamp used is of the proper value; the stamp must also be of the proper denomination, that is, the peculiar stamp appropriated to the species of instrument (3). A receipt-stamp will not avail, if used upon a promissory note; nor a note-stamp, if used upon a receipt. So, articles of agreement under seal require a deed stamp; an agreement-stamp will not be sufficient, though it may be of greater value (4). An agreement for a house, and also for goods in the house, requires a lease-stamp; and, unless it is so stamped, cannot be given in evidence as an agreement for the sale of the goods, in an action to recover the amount (5). The statute 37 G. 3. *c. 136. contemplates the mistakes, which may arise in the use of stamps, and makes provision for those mistakes. It enacts, that where any instrument, (except bills, notes, and drafts,) shall have been stamped with a stamp of a different denomination, but of equal or greater value than that required by law, the commissioners, upon payment of the duty and a penalty of 5l., may stamp the same with a proper stamp. With respect to bills and notes, (which by statute 31 G. 3. c. 25. were forbidden to be stamped after they were made,) the statute of the 37th G. 3. provides, that bills and notes, which should be made subsequent to that act, and stamped with an improper stamp, but of equal or greater value than the stamp required, may be stamped by the commissioners on payment of the duty and a penalty. But bills and notes before that act remain in the same situation as if the act had not passed. The statute 43 G. 3. c. 127. s. 6. provides, that, if the stamp is of the

* 389

(3) Stat. 37 G. 3. c. 136. s. 1. Stat. 48 G. 3. c. 149. s. 4. Chamberlain v. Porter, 1 New Rep. 30.

(4) Robinson v. Drybrough, 6 T. R. 317.

(5) Corder v. Drakeford, 3 Taunt. 382.

proper denomination, it shall not be ineffectual from being of a greater value than the stamp acts require. Before this act, a stamp of greater value, though of the proper denomination, was determined to be insufficient (1). In the case of Taylor v. Hague (2), indeed, before the statute of the 43d G. 3. the court held, that a promissory note upon a stamp of a higher value than was required, would be available, on the particular ground, that the value was composed of three different sums applicable to several funds, to which the duties on promissory notes are carried.

Where several stamps are necessary.

A question has often arisen, whether an instrument, to which several persons are parties, require several stamps, or whether a single stamp is sufficient. And the distinction established, is, that if the interest of the parties relates to one thing, which is the subject-matter of the instrument, or, in other words, if the instrument affects the separate interests of several, and there is a community of the same subject-matter as to all the parties (3), there a single stamp
* 390 *will be sufficient; but where the parties have separate interests in several subject-matters, there ought to be a separate stamp for each party, against whom, or in whose favour, the instrument is offered in evidence.

To illustrate the first part of the rule, if a debtor compounds with his creditors, and each creditor sign the same deed, covenanting either to give further day of payment, or to take a certain sum as a composition; there, every covenant is in fact a separate covenant, and the several deed of each creditor, who signs the deed; but the whole being only one transaction, a separate stamp for each person is not required (1). So, if several persons bind themselves severally in a penalty by one bond, conditioned for the performance of certain acts by each and every of them, such a bond requires only one stamp (2). Upon the same principle, it has been held, that an agreement relating to the

(1) Farr v. Price, 1 East 55.
(2) 2 East 414.
(3) 13 East 246.

(1) 1 New Rep. 273.
(2) Bowen v. Ashley, 1 New Rep. 274.

prize shares of different persons, though several as to the share of each, yet being payable in respect only of one entire fund, is only chargeable with one stamp (3); and on the authority of this case, the court of King's Bench determined in a very late case, that a single stamp was sufficient for an agreement, which several persons had entered into for a subscription to one common fund, for the purpose of constructing a dock (4). In the case of Jones v. Sandys (5), the question was, whether a bond, in the condition of which a mortgage-deed was mentioned, ought to have had two stamps; and the court held that it was not necessary; and in delivering their opinion, they mentioned the cases of bargain and sale, lease and release, mortgage with covenant to pay the money, as constantly charged with only the single duty.

But the rule is different, where the instrument includes in effect several transactions, and the subject-matter is distinct as to the several parties. Thus, an instrument, *containing the admissions of several persons to a corporation, requires as many stamps as there are admissions. This was determined in the case of the King v. Reeks (1), where, in a trial at bar on an information in the nature of a quo warranto, to prove the admission of the defendant, a paper was produced, containing the admissions of the defendant and four other burgesses, which paper was stamped only with one stamp; it was then objected, on the part of the court, that this paper having only a single stamp could not be admitted to be read in evidence; for the statute 9 &10 W. 3. c. 25. s. 27. enacts, that a certain duty shall be paid for every piece of parchment or paper upon which any admission into any corporation, &c. shall be written, and the 59th section enacts, that "if any instrument or writing by that act intended to be stamped, shall, contrary to the intent thereof, be written or engrossed by any person whatsoever, (not being a known officer, who in respect of

* 391

(3) Baker v. Jardine, 13 East 235. n. (b).

(4) Davis v. Williams, 13 East 232.

(5) Barnes 463.

(1) 2 Ld. Raym. 1445. 2 Str. 716. S. C.

any public office or employment shall be entitled to write the same,) upon parchment or paper not stamped according to that act, then there shall be paid over and above the duty for such instrument ten pounds; and that no such instrument shall be pleaded or given in evidence in any court, or admitted in any court to be good or available in law or equity, until as well the said duty as ten pounds should be paid, &c. and a receipt produced for the same, &c.;" under this section of the act it was insisted, that the instrument in question, being an admission of five persons to be burgesses, ought to have five stamps; that it could be good for none for the uncertainty, or at most it could be good only for one; if it was good for any, it must be for the first named; but the defendant was the third name, and therefore it could not be good for him. And of this opinion, as the reporter adds, was the whole court, after argument. The counsel for the defendant then offered in evidence four other distinct pieces of parchment, bearing date on the day mentioned in the information, each of them being duly stamped, which imported the several admissions
* 392 *and swearings of the four burgesses last named in the other parchment, and one of them the particular swearing and admission of the defendant. But the witness who produced these pieces of parchment proved that the entries were not made upon them, nor were any of them stamped, till near two months after the day on which they bore date; and, an objection being taken on this ground to the single instrument, which stated that the defendant alone was admitted and sworn, the court was clearly of opinion, that it could not be admitted in evidence; for by the act the admission is to be on paper or parchment, stamped at the time; otherwise it is not to be given in evidence, till the penalty is paid, and certificate thereof produced.

In the case of the King v. Reeks, which has been just mentioned, the instrument first offered in evidence purported to contain the admissions of five burgesses, and it does not appear, that the single stamp, which was impressed, applied more to the defendant's name than to any

of the others. This circumstance distinguishes that case from two others lately decided, Powell v. Edmunds (1), and Doe on the demise of Sir Joseph Copley v. Day (2), in which a paper containing contracts by several persons relative to different things, though stamped with a single stamp, was adjudged to be good evidence as to one of the contracting parties, because the stamp appeared to be applicable exclusively to his name. In the first case, the paper contained an agreement signed by the defendant for a lot of timber, and underneath a second agreement with another person for a different lot; this last had pencil marks drawn across it, as if for the purpose of striking it out; the stamp was affixed on that part of the paper on which the defendant's agreement was written, and below was the stamp officer's receipt for a penalty "for making the above agreement." An objection was taken on the *ground of there being a single stamp, which was over- * 393
ruled at the trial, and afterwards by the court of King's Bench. In the other case (2), the paper contained a variety of independent lettings of land between the landlord and a number of his tenants, one of whom was the defendant; the stamp was affixed opposite the defendant's name, and it appeared from the receipt of the stamp-officer, that the money was paid for affixing it after the commencement of the action, and only a short time before the trial; the instrument also appeared, when produced in evidence, to be cancelled with black lead pencil marks as to every name except that of the defendant, and it was not proved that the instrument was not so cancelled at the time when the stamp was affixed. Under these circumstances, the court held that the single stamp was intended to be applied to the contract with the defendant, and consequently that the paper was admissible. "If, indeed," said Lord Ellenborough, C. J. "the instrument had been required to substantiate the several contracts with the different tenants, no doubt there should have been a stamp affixed to each, al-

(1) 12 East 6.
(2) 13 East 241. See also Waddington v. Francis, 5 Esp. N. P. C. 182.

though the same terms of agreement applied to all; one stamp has been only held to be sufficient upon an instrument affecting the separate interests of several, where there has been a community of the same subject-matter as to all the parties. But here it sufficiently appears from the circumstances of the case, that the stamp was meant to be applied to the defendant's signature."

Alteration of stamped instrument.

When a stamped instrument has been once used for one purpose, it cannot be altered without a new stamp. If the parties have altered their original intention, and make a new instrument, different from that which they originally contemplated, a new stamp will be necessary (2). If a bill of exchange, for example, has been once effected, and has issued in a perfect form from the drawer to the acceptor, by whom it was returned with his acceptance to the drawer, *394 *it cannot be altered without being re-stamped. Thus, in the case of Bowman v. Nichol (1), where a bill of exchange had been drawn on a proper stamp, payable 21 days after date, and, while it continued in the hands of the drawer, was altered with the consent of the acceptor to be made payable 51 days after date, and was again altered to 21 days after date, subsequently to the time of its becoming payable according to its original form; the court of King's Bench held, that, at the time when the last alteration was made, the operation of the bill, as it originally stood, was quite spent; that it was a new and distinct transaction between the parties; and that there ought to have been a new stamp. So where a promissory note, payable by the defendant to the plaintiff or order (2), was originally expressed to be for value received, but, on the day after it had been signed and delivered by the defendant to the plaintiff, was with the consent of the parties altered by the addition of the words "for the good will of a lease and trade," the court held, that the alteration was a material

(2) 15 East 418.

(1) 5 T. R. 537. See also Master v. Miller, 4 T. R. 320. Cardwell v. Martin, 1 Camp. 79; 9 East 190., S. C. Bathe v. Taylor, 15 East 412. Calvert v. Roberts, 3 Campb. 343; the case of an accommodation-bill.

(2) Knill v. Williams, 10 East 431.

one, because it was evidence of a fact, which, if necessary to be inquired into, must otherwise have been proved by different evidence, and also because it pointed out the particular consideration for the note, and put the holder upon inquiring, whether that consideration had passed; a new stamp was therefore necessary, for the want of which the note could not be received in evidence. The same rule is equally applicable to the case of an accommodation bill (3).

By the 13th section of the stat. 35 G. 3. c. 63., (relating to stamp-duties on sea-insurances,) it is provided, "that nothing in that act shall be construed to extend to prohibit the making of any alteration, which may lawfully be made in the terms or conditions of any policy of insurance duly stamped, after the same shall have been underwritten, *or to require any additional stamp-duty by reason of such alteration, so that such alteration be made before notice of the determination of the risk originally insured, and the premium or consideration, originally paid or contracted for, shall exceed the rate of 10 shillings per cent. on the sum insured, and so that the thing insured shall remain the property of the same persons, and so that such alteration shall not prolong the term insured beyond the period allowed by this act, and so that no additional or further sum shall be insured by means of such alteration." On the construction of this clause, in the case of Kensington v. Inglis (1), where the policy was "on goods and specie on board of ship or ships sailing between the 1st of October 1799, and the 1st of June 1800, being the property which should first sail to a certain amount, and upon the vessels carrying the goods," and a memorandum was written on the policy, and subscribed by the defendant, on the 11th of June 1800, before any notice of the determination of the risk had been received, by which memorandum it was agreed to extend the time of sailing to the first of August following; in this case the court of King's Bench held, that the memorandum did not require

* 395

(3) Calvert v. Roberts, 3 Campb. 343.

(1) 8 East 273.

a stamp; for although the time of sailing was extended, yet no new subject of insurance is introduced by the memorandum, but the object insured continues the same. In another case (2), which occurred upon the same clause, where the policy was originally "on ship and *outfit*," from London to the South Seas, but after the sailing of the ship was altered by consent of the underwriters, and declared to be "on the ship and *goods*," instead of ship and *outfit*, the court determined that as the *outfit*, originally insured, was essentially different from *goods*, which were afterwards made the subject of insurance, the policy in its altered state required an additional stamp. The question is, said Lord Ellenborough, C. J., in delivering the judgment of the court, whether that part of the pro-
* 396 *vision, which requires that "the thing insured shall remain the property of the same person" has been in this case complied with. The words, "the thing insured shall *remain* the property," appear properly to require and apply to *one* identical and continued subject-matter of insurance; such subject-matter *all along remaining* the property of the same proprietor, and to be ill-suited to a case like the present, where the thing last insured is, not only in fact, but in name and kind, (as a specific subject of insurance) essentially different from the thing first insured, and which begins also to have an existence at a different and much later period than the other, and when the thing first insured scarcely, or in a small degree only, *remains* or continues to exist at all."

But where an alteration is made in an instrument with the consent of all parties, in order to correct a mistake, and to make the instrument consistent with the original intention of the parties, there it has been held, that a fresh stamp is not necessary. Thus, in the case of Kershaw v. Cox (1), where a bill had been drawn, payable to the defendant but not payable to order, the defendant, on the day after the bill was drawn, indorsed it over to the plaintiff, without advert-

(2) Hill v. Patten, 8 East 373. Blanc, J. cited 10 East 435., and 15 East 417.
(1) 3 Esp. N. P. C. 246. cor. Le

ing to the omission of the words "or order;" on the same day the plaintiff returned it to the defendant to get the omission rectified, and the drawer then inserted the words; here there was strong evidence to show, that the omission was by mistake, for the bill was intended to be negotiable, and, as such, immediately indorsed, as if it had been drawn payable to order, and, as soon as the omission was discovered, it was rectified by the proper parties; the learned Judge, therefore, who tried the cause, left it to the jury to consider, whether the words afterwards added had been originally intended to have been inserted, but were omitted by mistake; and the jury, finding this to be the case, it was ruled, that a fresh stamp was not required. The point was *afterwards brought before the court of King's Bench, on a motion to enter a nonsuit, and the alteration was adjudged to be allowable under the stamp acts; having been made merely for the purpose of rectifying a mistake in drawing the bill contrary to the intention of the parties. In another case, which occurs upon this subject, where an action was brought against the defendant as acceptor of a bill of exchange (1), it appeared that the defendant and another person being indebted to the plaintiff, agreed to give him a bill of exchange, to be drawn by the one and accepted by the other (the defendant); instead of this they sent him a promissory note made by the one and indorsed by the other, which the plaintiff immediately returned, that it might be altered into a bill of exchange, according to the agreement, and the alteration was accordingly made; an objection was taken, on the ground that the instrument required a fresh stamp; but Lord Ellenborough, C. J. ruled, that the stamp impressed was sufficient to render the instrument available, since it had not been negotiated as a promissory note, and the alteration might be treated as the correction of a mistake, according to the terms of the original agreement. * 397

So, when a bill of sale of a ship, in reciting the certifi-

(1) Webber v. Maddocks, 3 Campb. 1.

cate of registry, stated Guernsey as the port where the certificate was granted, instead of Weymouth, and in this state was executed, but the mistake being afterwards discovered, was rectified with the consent of all parties, and the deed delivered de novo (2); the question was, whether this second delivery made a new stamp necessary; Lord Ellenborough, C. J., in delivering the judgment of the court, referred to statute 26 G. 3. c. 60. s. 17., which enacts, that a bill of sale of a registered ship, which does not truly and accurately recite the certificate of registry in words at length, shall be utterly null and void to all intents and
* 398 *purposes. "This bill of sale, therefore, when first executed, was, from the mistake in the recital of the certificate of registry, to all intents and purposes null and void; it took no effect whatever from its first delivery; and the stamp impressed upon it was wholly inoperative. This defect arose not from intention, but from mistake. The instrument, as first executed, was not what the parties meant to execute; and it was not in the state in which it was at first intended to be, till it was altered. This is not the case of substituting a new and second contract, in the place of a preceding effectual one, upon a change of intention in the parties; but merely making the contract what it was originally intended to have been; and in such a case, where the instrument upon its first execution was void to all intents and purposes, where its insufficiency arose from a mere mistake, where in consequence of that mistake it was not in the state in which it was intended to have been when it was so executed, and where upon its second execution it is only put into that state which was originally intended, we think it is not going beyond the fair spirit of the stamp-laws to hold, that upon such second execution, being the first which was effectually operative, a new stamp was not requisite." So, the mistake of an agent, in declaring the interest in the margin of a policy to be on a ship by a

(2) Cole and others, Assignees of Doyle, v. Parkin, 12 East 471.

wrong name, may be rectified by inserting the true name, without a fresh stamp (1).

Where an unstamped instrument may be evidence for collateral purposes.

Written instruments have been admitted in evidence without a stamp, in certain cases, where they were produced merely to prove something collateral, and not for the purpose of being enforced between the parties, and where it was not material to consider, whether the instruments were good or available in law. In the case of Holland, q. t. v. Duffin (2), which was an action to recover several sums of money forfeited by insuring tickets in the *lottery, contrary to the statute 22 G. 3. c. 47. s. 13., Lord Kenyon held, that an instrument, purporting to be a policy of insurance, might be given in evidence, though not stamped as a policy; for such a contract is declared by the act to be illegal and void, and could not have been intended by the legislature as an object of taxation. And in an action of debt for bribery at an election (1), under the stat. 2 G. 2. c. 24. s. 7., Lord Ellenborough, C. J. held, that an unstamped promissory note, payable to the defendant, which a witness said he had given for the re-payment of money received by him as a voter from the defendant, (one of the candidates), might be admitted as evidence of the transaction, to corroborate the testimony of the witness. So, an unstamped receipt may be shown to the witness, as a memorandum, in order to refresh his recollection of a fact there stated (2). So, the unstamped part of an agreement is admissible, on the part of the plaintiff, as secondary evidence of the agreement, after proof of notice to the defendant to produce the stamped part, which is in his possession (3); and there can be no difference in this respect, whether the plaintiff has specially declared upon the agreement, or merely offers it as evidence in the course of the cause. So, in the case of a parish-settlement, although

* 399

(1) Robinson v. Touray, 1 Maule & Selw. 217. Sawtell v. Loudon, 5 Taunt. 359.

(2) Peake's N. P. C. 57.

(1) Dover v. Maestaer, 5 Esp. N. P. C. 92.

(2) Rambert v. Cohen, 4 Esp. N. P. C. 213. Jacob v. Lindsay, 1 East 460. See ante, p. 209. 386.

(3) Garnons v. Swift, 1 Taunt. 507 Waller v. Horsfall, 1 Campb. 501.

a general hiring cannot be presumed from the mere fact of service, where the service has been performed under written articles of agreement, which are not admissible in evidence for the want of a proper stamp, yet, where the question is, whether the service commenced after the expiration of the articles, they may be inspected for the purpose of ascertaining whether they would apply to the subsequent service (4). And, upon the same principle, it should seem, in an action for the non-delivery of goods, if the contract is proved by parol evidence, and it should appear that the parties made a contract on unstamped paper, the court may inspect the
* 400 *instrument, to see whether it applies to the goods which are the subject of the action; and, if they are not included in the contract, the parol evidence would be properly admitted (1). So, a written agreement may be recovered in an action of trover, though unstamped (2); and, in such an action, it will not be necessary to give notice to the other party to produce the agreement (3). So, in an action for money lent, where the plaintiff proved that he had advanced the money to the defendant, who gave him a note for the amount on unstamped paper, and the defence was, that he had been induced to give the note in a state of intoxication, without having received any part of the money, Lord Ellenborough, C. J. held, that the note might be inspected by the jury, as a cotemporary writing, to prove or disprove the fraud imputed to the plaintiff (4).

A paper, purporting to be a bill of exchange or promissory note, may be given in evidence, though unstamped, to support an indictment for forgery, or for uttering with a knowledge of the forgery (5); for, "the stamp acts being revenue laws, and not intended to affect the crime of for-

(4) R. v. Pendleton, 15 East 449. 455.

(1) 15 East 455.

(2) Scott v. Jones, 4 Taunt. 865.

(3) Ib., and see ante, p. 339.

(4) Gregory v. Fraser, 3 Campb. 454.

(5) Hawkeswood's case, 1783, 1 Leach. Cr. C. 292., 2 East P. C. 955. S. C. Lee's case, 1784, 1 Leach Cr. C. 293. n. (a). Morton's case, 1795, 2 East P. C. 955. Reculists' case, 1796, 2 Leach Cr. C. 811. Davies's case, 1796, 2 East P. C. 956. See Whitwell v. Dimsdale, Peake N. P. C. 168.

gery, cannot alter the law respecting it; the stamp is not, properly speaking, any part of the instrument, but merely a mark impressed on the paper, to denote the payment of a duty, and is collateral to the instrument itself: and as to the statute enacting (6), "that no promissory note, bill of exchange, &c., not stamped, as therein directed, shall be pleaded or given in evidence in any court, or admitted in any court to be good, or available in law or equity," the legislature thereby meant only to prevent their being given in evidence, when they were proceeded upon, to recover the value of the money thereby secured. It is cer-
*tain that no holder of such an instrument as the present * 401
could, if it had been genuine, have founded an action upon it, and given it in evidence as a *promissory note;* but it is equally certain, that it might have been given in evidence on other occasions, as, for instance, if a person negotiating it were to be sued for the penalty inflicted upon the offence of negotiating such an instrument unstamped, there is no doubt, but that it might be given in evidence; and this instance shows most clearly, that it was properly received in evidence on the trial of this indictment, notwithstanding the seeming prohibitory words in the statutes (1)."

In the case of the King v. Pooley (2), the prisoner was indicted under the statute 7 G. 3. c. 50. s. 1., which makes it a capital felony for any person, employed in receiving letters, to secrete any letter containing a bank-note, or any warrant or draft, &c. for the payment of money. It appeared at the trial, that the draft contained in the letter, which the prisoner had secreted, was drawn above ten miles from the banking-house; the prisoner's counsel then objected, that, as the draft was on unstamped paper, it was not a valid order for the payment of money, and therefore not within the statute on which the prisoner was indicted; and they founded this objection on the sta-

(6) St. 31. G. 3. c. 25. s. 19.

(1) By Grose, J. in delivering the opinion of the judges in Reculists' case, 2 Leach Cr. C. 813.

(2) 3 Bos. & Pull. 311.

tute 31 G. 3. c. 25., the fourth section of which exempts from stamps only such orders for the payment of money as are drawn on a banker residing within ten miles of the place where the order is made, and the nineteenth section provides, that no bill, note, draft, &c. shall be pleaded or given in evidence in any court, or admitted in any court to be good, useful, or available in law or equity, unless they are written on paper duly stamped. This point was reserved at the trial, and the case was afterwards argued before the Judges in the Exchequer-Chamber; when the
* 402 *objection taken on the part of the prisoner was, first, that which has been stated, namely, that the draft in question was not a draft for the payment of money, within the meaning of the stat. 7 G. 3. c. 50. s. 1.; and, secondly, that the indictment, which averred that the draft was in force at the time of the secreting, had not been proved, as from the want of a stamp the draft had never been available. The opinion of the Judges was not publicly declared: but the prisoner received a pardon for the offence charged in the indictment; and he was afterwards tried (1) on the second section of the same act, which makes it a capital offence for any person to rob any mail of a letter or packet, or to steal or take any letter from any mail, or from any place for the receipt of letters, &c. It was objected at the second trial, that the draft before mentioned, being on unstamped paper could not be received in evidence as a medium to show that the prisoner had stolen the letter: but the court overruled the objection, being of opinion, "that the draft, though unstamped, might be admitted in evidence for collateral purposes, though not for the purpose of recovering the money mentioned in it, and the evidence was accordingly received." Here the paper was not offered in evidence as it was on the former trial, as a draft for the payment of money, but merely as a paper contained in the letter, and the fact of the prisoner having this paper in his possession, was evi-

(1) 3 Bos. & Pull. 315. And this part of the case is reported in 1 East Pl. Cr., addenda, xvii.

dence against him of his having stolen the letter in which it was contained.

An objection, similar to that which was taken on the former trial in the last case, was again made in the case of the King v. Gillson (2). The indictment was for feloniously setting fire to a certain house with intent to defraud an insurance company; at the trial, a policy of insurance was given in evidence on the part of the prosecution, by *which the prisoner's goods, in a house there described, were insured against fire, and upon this policy a memorandum was indorsed, stating that the goods insured had been removed from the house described in the policy to another house mentioned in the memorandum, in which last-mentioned house the prisoner was charged with having committed the felony; the policy was properly stamped, but the memorandum had no stamp; and the objection taken for the prisoner was, that in support of the charge it was essentially necessary to show, that there subsisted a legally effective contract, and that, by the express provision of the stamp-acts, the memorandum in question not being stamped could not be given in evidence, or be good or available in any manner whatever; and a distinction was drawn between this case and the above mentioned, where an unstamped forged instrument was admitted in evidence against the party charged with having forged it, or with uttering it knowing it to be forged. The point was reserved for the opinion of the Judges, and argued in the Exchequer-Chamber; and judgment was afterwards given at the Old Bailey, that the prisoner should be discharged. * 403

If an instrument, which ought to be stamped, is proved to have been lost, parol evidence of its contents may be admitted, without proof of the stamp being regular; it may be presumed under the circumstances of the case, that the instrument was duly stamped, where the contrary is not shown (1). In the latest case upon this point, on a question

(2) 1 Taunt. 25.

(1) R. v. East Knoyle, Burr. Set. Case 151. 1 Bott. 547. S. C. R. v. Badby, 1 Bott. 549., S. P.

of settlement between two parishes (2), it appeared that an indenture of apprenticeship, which had been regularly executed thirty years before, was delivered to the apprentice at the end of the term, and lost; that a premium was paid with the apprentice; and further, that the parish in which he had served under the indenture, had for many years treated him as one of their parishioners; on the other
* 404 *side it was proved by the deputy register and comptroller of the apprentice duties, that it did not appear that such an indenture had been stamped with the premium stamp, or enrolled, from the time of the date to the time of the trial of the appeal; but the court of King's Bench were of opinion, that the court below were right in presuming that the indenture had been properly stamped. "The question before the Justices," said Lord Ellenborough, "was, whether the presumption, that all was rightly done after the lapse of so many years, was sufficiently rebutted by the negative evidence of the officer; they thought not, and we cannot say that they have done wrong; for the presumption of law is to be favoured, and against the negative evidence they may have set the possibility of an irregularity in the returns made to the office."

If an action cannot be brought upon an agreement, until it is stamped, it must be stamped before the commencement of the action: but if it is an agreement which may be stamped on the payment of a penalty, then it may be stamped during the action (1). In some cases the legislature has declared, that the paper cannot be stamped after it has been written, as in stat. 35 G. 3. c. 63. s. 14. concerning sea-insurances (2). In other cases it is declared, that a penalty shall be incurred by writing on unstamped paper; and that the instrument is not available in evidence, until the duty and penalty are first paid, and a receipt for them produced, and until the instrument is marked with a

(2) R. v. Long Buckby, 7 East 45.
(1) 9 Ves. jun. 252. 11 Ves. jun. 103.
(2) Roderick v. Hovil, 3 Campb. 595.

proper stamp (3). Here the defect may be cured by having a proper stamp affixed, which may be done by paying the duty, together with the penalty for not having the instrument stamped within the time limited (4). In other cases the legislature only impose a penalty for not having the instrument duly stamped; and in these, though *the party would be liable to a penalty, yet the paper may be given in evidence, though unstamped (1). It has been before mentioned (2), that the defendant after paying money into court, in an action on a bill of exchange, cannot object to the sufficiency of the stamp. The payment of money admits the validity of the instrument. * 405

By the stat. 48 G. 3. c. 149. (3), which regulates the present stamp duties, every agreement, minute, or memorandum of agreement, (not particularly exempted,) that is made in England under-hand only, or made in Scotland without any clause of registration, is liable to a stamp in proportion to the number of words contained, *when the subject-matter is of the value of* 20l. *or upwards*, whether the same shall be only evidence of a contract, or obligatory upon the parties from its being a written instrument. Agreements.

An agreement is to be stamped in proportion to the number of words which it contains, not according to the number of items agreed upon. But if the parties add another item to an agreement which is already complete, and has been executed between them, an additional stamp ought to be annexed, to make such new item available. As, if two persons lay a wager, and write it down in the form of an agreement, which is stamped, and afterwards by another agreement, indorsed on the first, they consent that the bet shall be doubled; here there ought to be two agreement-stamps, or the party cannot recover on the last

(3) St. 5 & 6 W. & M. c. 21. s. 11. 12 Ann. st. 2. c. 9. s. 25. St. 37 G. 3. c. 136. s. 2.

(4) R. v. Bishop of Chester, 1 Stra. 624.

(1) R. v. Pearce, Peake N. P. C. 75.

(2) Israel v. Benjamin, 3 Campb. 40 Ante, p. 143.

(3) See also St. 23 G. 3. c. 58. s. 3. St. 35 G. 3. c. 30. s. 1. 6. St. 37 G. 3. c. 90. s. 1. 6.

bet (4). A written ackowledgment of the payment of money, stamped as a receipt, is evidence of the fact of payment, although there may be other writing on the same paper amounting to an agreement, provided this does not in any manner control or qualify the former part (5).

* 406 *A cognovit being a mere acknowledgment of an account without any mutuality, does not require a stamp. But if there be any thing of agreement beyond the mere authority to enter a cognovit, then a stamp becomes necessary. Thus, where the defendant gave a cognovit to the plaintiff on unstamped paper, by which he agreed to confess, that the plaintiff had sustained a damage in the action to the amount of 30l., on which no judgment was to be entered, unless the defendant made default in payment of the sum of 5l. by instalments, together with costs to be taxed, the court held, that, in consequence of the terms which had been added, the paper in question amounted to an agreement; but that it was an agreement for less than 20l., and therefore not liable to a stamp (1).

The following particulars are exempted from stamp-duties imposed on agreements (2).

1. Any label or memorandum containing the heads of insurances to be made by the Royal Exchange Assurance and London Assurance.

2. Memorandum or agreement for granting a lease or tack, at rack-rent, of any land or tenement, under the yearly rent of 5l.

Whether a particular agreement is to be considered as a lease, (in which case it will require a lease-stamp,) or merely as an agreement for a lease, must depend entirely on the intention of the parties, as it is to be collected from the whole of the instrument. If the words are that the one

(4) Robson v. Hall, Peake N. P. C. 127. Lord Kenyon was of opinion, that the plaintiff might recover on the *original* bet. But the plaintiff was non-suited on another point.

(5) Grey v. Smith, 1 Campb. 387.

(1) Ames v. Hill, 2 Bos. & Pull. 150. Reardon v. Swaby, 4 East 188. S. P.

(2) St. 48 G. 3. c. 149. See also St. 23 G. 3. c. 58. s. 3. St. 35 G. 3. c. 30. s. 1. 6. St. 37 G. 3. c. 90. s. 1. 6.

party *does* thereby demise, &c., or that the other party *shall* have, &c., and no other words appear to qualify the expression, they are to be construed as a lease (3). And *where the instrument appears to have been intended to transfer a present interest, or where it contains words of present demise without any thing to show that the parties had in contemplation a mere executory contract, the instrument will be considered as an actual lease, notwithstanding there may be a stipulation for executing a subsequent lease under seal (1). If indeed the words do not import immediate possession, (as where it is agreed that the party *shall* have and enjoy the land, &c.) such a stipulation would warrant the conclusion, that the instrument was intended, not as of itself a perfect lease, but as an agreement for a lease (2). * 407

3. Memorandum or agreement for the hire of any labourer, artificer, manufacturer, or menial servant.

An agreement for the assignment of an apprentice from one master to another is not within the meaning of this clause; the term "hiring" not being applicable to an apprentice (3).

4. Memorandum, letter, or agreement, made for or relating to the sale of any goods, wares, or merchandize.

Upon this clause it has been determined, that an agreement by the defendant to take a share of some goods, which had been bought by the plaintiff on their joint account, and to pay for them at a certain time, is an agreement *relating to* the sale of goods, and therefore exempted from a stamped duty (4); so also is an agreement by a broker to indemnify his principal, for whom he bought goods, from any loss on a re-sale (5); or a guaranty for

(3) Drake v. Munday, Cro. Car. 207. Maldon's case, Cro. El. 33. 5 T. R. 167.

(1) Harrington v. Wise, Cro. El. 486. Tisdale v. Sir W. Essex, Hob. 34. Baxter v. Brown, 2 Black. 973. Barry v. Nugent, cited 5 T. R. 165. 167. Poole v. Bentley, 2 Campb. 286., 12 East 168. S. C. Tempest v. Rawling, 13 East 18.

(2) Doe dem. Jackson v. Ashburner, 5 T. R. 163. And see Coore v. Clare, 2 T. R. 739.

(3) R. v. St. Paul's, Bedford, 6 T. R. 453.

(4) Venning v. Leckie, 13 East 7.

(5) Curry v. Edenser, 3 T. R. 524.

*the payment of goods, which a third person was about to purchase to a certain amount (1); or a receipt for the price of a horse containing a warranty of soundness (2).

An agreement for the making of goods is a mere executory contract for work to be done, not for the *sale* of goods; consequently it is not within the exemption (3). But a written memorandum, ordering goods to be made, but not proving the contract between the parties, may be admitted in evidence without a stamp, as it is not an agreement (4).

An agreement for the sale of crops growing on certain lands, to be delivered afterwards, has been determined to be an agreement for an interest in land, and is therefore not exempted as a sale for *goods* (5). "The subject-matter of the agreement," said Mr. Justice Heath, in the case of Waddington v. Bristow (5), "must be taken with reference to the time at which the contract was made. Now at that time the crops did not exist in the state of goods." And Mr. Justice Chambre said, "Though I admit that a contract for the sale of so many hops as twenty-two acres might produce, to be delivered at a distant day, might fall within the exemption of the act, notwithstanding the hops were not in the state of goods at the time of the contract made, yet I cannot think the present agreement within the exemption, since it gives an interest to the vendee in the produce of the vendor's land." But where the owner of a close, cropped with potatoes, agreed to sell them at a certain rate, and the purchaser was to take them up immediately, the court of King's Bench held, that this agreement was not for any interest
* 409 *in the land (1); and the distinction, taken between this and the two cases just mentioned, was, that there the con-

(1) Warrington v. Furbor, 3 East 242.

(2) Skrine v. Elmore, 2 Campb. 407.

(3) Towers v. Sir J. Osborne, 1 Stra. 506., 7 T. R. 17. Buxton v. Bedall, 3 East 303.

(4) Ingram v. Lea, 2 Campb. 521.

(5) Waddington v. Bristow, 2 Bos. & Pull. 453. Crosby v. Wadsworth, 6 East 602. Emmerson v. Heelis 2 Taunt. 38.

(1) Parker v. Staniland, 11 East 362.

tracts were for the growing crops of hops and grass, (and therefore the purchasers of the crops had an immediate interest in the land, while the crops were growing to maturity,) but here the land was to be considered as a mere warehouse for the potatoes, till the purchasers could remove them, which was to be done immediately. So, where the agreement was to sell all the potatoes growing on a certain piece of land of the defendant, and the plaintiff to dig them up and carry them away, the Court held, that the contract was confined to the sale of the potatoes, as mere chattels, and that nothing else was in the contemplation of the parties (2).

5. Memorandum or agreement made between the master and mariners of any ship or vessel, for wages, on any voyage coastwise from port to port in Great Britain.

6. Letters containing any agreement (not before exempted) in respect of any merchandize, or evidence of such an agreement, which shall pass by the post, between merchants and other persons carrying on trade or commerce in Great Britain, and residing and actually being at the time of sending such letters at the distance of 50 miles from each other (3).

A letter written by one, who managed another person's trade, to a creditor, promising to pay a debt which arose in the regular course, has been held to come within the letter and spirit of this exemption (4).

*CHAP. X. *410

Of the Admissibility of Parol Evidence to explain, vary, or discharge Written Instruments.

The order, in which it is proposed to treat of this intricate and extensive subject, is, First to consider in what

(2) Warwick v. Bruce, 2 Maule & Sel. 205.

(3) Leigh v. Banner, 1 Esp. N. P. C. 403.

(4) M'Kenzie v. Banks, 5 T. R. 176.

cases parol evidence is admissible to explain ambiguities in written instruments; Secondly, whether parol evidence is admissible to add to, vary, or discharge written instruments; and, Thirdly, to consider the rule of evidence on this subject, established in courts of equity.

Sect. I.

Of the Admissibility of Parol Evidence to explain Ambiguities.

There are two sorts of ambiguities of words, says Lord Bacon (1); the one is called *ambiguitas latens*, the other *ambiguitas patens*. The first occurs, where the deed or instrument is sufficiently certain and free from ambiguity, but the ambiguity is produced by evidence of something extrinsic, or some collateral matter out of the instrument; the latter kind is such as appears on the face of the instrument itself.

Latent ambiguity.

In the first case, the ambiguity, which is raised by extrinsic evidence, may be explained in the same manner. Thus, if a person grant his manor of S. to one and his heirs, so far there appears to be no ambiguity; but if it should be proved, that the grantor has the manors both of South S. and North S., this ambiguity is matter in fact, and parol evidence may be admitted to show, which of the two manors the party intended to convey (2). So, it was *411 *resolved in Lord Cheyney's case (1), if a person has two sons both baptized by the name of John, and conceiving, that the elder who had been long absent is dead, devises his land by his will in writing to his son generally, and in truth the elder is living, in this case the younger son may in pleading or in evidence allege the devise to him, and if it is denied, he may produce witnesses to prove his father's

(1) Bac. Elem., rule 23.
(2) Bac. Elem., ib.
(1) 5 Rep. 68. b. See also Altham's case, 8 Rep. 155. Hob. 32. Jones v. Newman, 1 Blackst. 60. Harris v. Bp. of Lincoln, 2 P. Wms. 136.

intent, that he thought the other was dead; or, that at the time of making his will, he named his son John the younger, and the writer left out the addition. No inconvenience, adds Lord Coke, can arise, if an averment be taken in such a case; for he who sees the will, by which land is so devised, cannot be deceived by any secret averment; when he sees the devise to the testator's son John generally, he ought at his peril to inquire which John the testator intended, which may easily be known by him who wrote the will, and by others who were privy to the intent; and, if no direct proof can be made of his intent, there the devise is void for its uncertainty (*a*).

When a devise in a will is to a person, designated by a christian and surname without any other description, and no such person appears to claim the legacy, or to have been known by the testator, parol evidence may be admitted to show, that both the names have been mistaken by the person, who took the instructions for the will; as, in the case of Beaumont v. Fell (2), where a legacy was bequeathed to Catharine Earnley, and the name of the person who claimed the legacy was Gertrude Yardley, the Court established the claim, observing how very material it was, that no such person as Catharine Earnley claimed under the will. Here, there was no ambiguity on the face of the will, but the latent ambiguity was introduced by extrinsic *evidence, and the same kind of evidence also showed, that there was a person of the name of Gertrude whom the testator called Gatty, which name the person who drew the will mistook for Katy; in this case, therefore, as parol evidence was admitted to show the latent ambiguity, parol *412

(2) 2 P. Wms. 140. See also Dowset v. Sweet, Ambl. 175. Bradwin v. Harpur, Ambl. 374. Parsons v. Parsons, 1 Ves. jun. 266. 3 Ves. jun. 322. Smith v. Coney, 6 Ves. jun. 42. Doe dem. Cook v. Danvers, 7 East 303.

(*a*) In *Revere* v. *Leonard & another*, 1 *Mass. Rep.* 91, it was held that the grantor was incompetent to explain a latent ambiguity in his own grant, although not interested.

evidence was also admitted to explain it (*a*). So, where the testator bequeathed his stock in a particular fund, and it appeared, that he had not at the time of making his will or afterwards, any stock in that fund, having sold out some time before and purchased into another fund, evidence was admitted to show whence the mistake arose, and the legacy was satisfied out of the new fund, into which the testator had purchased (1). So, where the devise was "of *all* my farm and lands called Trogues-farm, now *in the occupation of A. C.*," the court of King's Bench were clearly of opinion, that two closes *in the occupation of L. M.*, but forming a part of Trogues-farm, would pass under the devise; and that a written notice from the testator to L. M. had been properly admitted in evidence, to show that he considered them as parcel of his farm called Trogues-farm (2). Here the devise was sufficiently comprehensive to include the whole of the lands, and ought not to be narrowed by the defective description of the occupation (*b*).

In the instances, which have been just mentioned, it is to be observed, that, unless the evidence had been admitted, the will could not have taken effect. In the first case, no person was to be found corresponding with the description in the devise; in the second, the testator had no property in the funds, out of which he appointed the legacy to be paid; and in the third, if the closes in question were not to be included as part of the devised farm, the word "all" in the devise would not be satisfied. And the question on

(1) Selwood v. Mildmay, 3 Ves. jun. 306.

(2) Goodtitle dem. Radford v. Southern, 1 Maule & Selw. 299.

(*a*) Vide post 416. n. (a).

(*b*) Where the devisor possessing real estate in W. devises in the following words: "I give and bequeath, &c. the farm which I now occupy," without any further description, parol evidence was held inadmissible to show that the land of the devisor, in W. which had been leased by him, and was in the occupation of the lessee, was intended to be included in the devise. *Jackson* d. *Van Vechten* v. *Sill & others*, 11 *Johns. Rep.* 201.

the admissibility of parol evidence, in such cases, will depend principally upon this, namely, whether the evidence *is necessary to give an effective operation to the devise, or whether, without that evidence, there appears to be sufficient to satisfy the terms of the devise and the intention of the testator as expressed on the face of the will. If the testator has left property which corresponds with the description in the will, extrinsic evidence is not admissible to show, that he intended to include other property not within that description (1). In the case of Whitbread v. May (2), where the testator, having devised all his estates in trust for his son for life with remainder over in strict settlement, &c., by a codicil afterwards revoked his will "so far as it related to *his estate at* Lushill, in the county of Wilts, and *Hearne* and Buckland, in the county of Kent, which he devised to his son in fee," it appeared, that at the time of the devise the testator had lands in the parish of *Hearne*, and in several other parishes, all which he had purchased by one contract from one person; evidence was then offered to show that the testator, by the description of his "*estate at Hearne*," meant to designate and include not only the lands in that parish, but also all the other lands which he had purchased at the same time. This evidence was received at the trial, subject to the opinion of the court above; and the Court of Common Pleas were afterwards equally divided in opinion on the question of its admissibility. In a much later case (3), however, which was very similar to the last, the Court of Common Pleas adjudged such evidence to be inadmissible. The question there was, whether on a devise of the testator's "*estate of Ashton*," parol evidence could be admitted to show, that the testator intended

*413

(1) Doe dem. Brown v. Brown, 11 East 441. 3 Taunt. 147.

(2) 2 Bos. and Pull. 593.

(3) Doe dem. Sir A. Chichester v. Oxenden, 3 Taunt. 147. A motion for a new trial was made in Mich. term, 1814, in the case of Doe on the demise of Brown v. Green, (which was tried by Mr. Justice Dallas at Gloucester,) on the ground of the rejection of evidence. The devise was of the testator's "*estate at Cosholm*," and evidence was offered to show, that the testator intended to devise other premises besides those *at Cosholm*, which was refused. And the Court of King's Bench were of opinion, that the evidence had been properly rejected, and refused to grant a rule.

by that description to devise all his maternal estate, which consisted of two manors in the parish of Ashton and another
*414 manor *in the adjoining parish; the Court of Common Pleas, after hearing two arguments, determined against its admissibility. The Chief Justice, Sir James Mansfield, in delivering the judgment of the court, after premising that he had felt considerable doubts on the subject in consequence of the case of Whitbread v. May, in which case the Court was equally divided on the admissibility of parol evidence, adverted to the case of Beaumont v. Fell (1), and to the similar case of Dowset v. Sweet (2), and observed on these cases, that although it was not expressly stated to have been necessary to receive the evidence in order to give effect to the will, yet that ground of determination might be inferred. "It will be found," said the Chief Justice, "that the will would have had no operation unless the evidence had been received. But, in the case now before the Court, the will has an effective operation without the evidence proposed; every thing will pass under it, that is in the manor or parish, or what he would naturally call his Ashton estate. This will be an effective operation; and, this being so, the case in this respect differs from all the others; because in them the evidence was admitted to explain that, which without such explanation could have had no operation. It is safer not to go beyond this line. Only those premises, therefore, will pass under the devise, which are in the manor or parish of Ashton."

In the case of Thomas v. Thomas (3), where the testator had devised to his grand-daughter, Mary Thomas of Llechlloyd, in Merthyr parish, it appeared, that at the time of his death he had a grand-daughter of the name of Elinor Evans, one of the lessors of the plaintiff, who lived in the place and parish named in the will, and also a great-grand-daughter, Mary Thomas, the defendant, the only person

(1) Vid. supr. 411.
(2) Vid. supr. 411.
(3) 6 T. R. 671. And see Lord Walpole v. Lord Cholmondeley, 7 T. R. 138.

of that name in the family, but who lived in another place, and had never been in Merthyr parish; the plaintiff's *counsel at the trial offered parol evidence to show, that the person who drew the will, had made a mistake in the name of the devisee; and Mr. Justice Lawrence received the evidence (1), subject to the opinion of the court above on its admissibility; but as the jury were of opinion, that the name had not been inserted by mistake, and therefore found for the defendant on the first count, which laid the demise from Elinor Evans, the admissibility of this evidence did not afterwards form any part of the argument. After this finding of the jury, the question was between Mary Thomas and the plaintiff on a demise from the heir at law, and in this stage of the cause the defendant's counsel offered evidence of declarations made by the devisor previous to the making of his will, expressive of his regard for the plaintiff, and of his intention of giving her the premises in dispute. But this evidence was rejected, on the ground, that nothing dehors the will could be received to show the intention of the testator, which could only be collected from the words of the will itself, after the removal of any latent ambiguity in the description of persons or other terms in the will. And this opinion was afterwards affirmed by the court of King's Bench. "If there had been no person," said Lord Kenyon, "to answer the description of grand daughter, living at Llechlloyd, in Merthyr parish, I should have rejected the description, and have said, that the devise applied to Mary Thomas; but it appears, that there is another person answering that part of the description, who is also (in another part of the will) an object of the testator's bounty. Then as there are two parts of the description not answering to Mary Thomas, who is named in this clause of the will, we are left to conjecture who was meant by the devisor; but the law will not allow an heir at law to be disinherited by con- *415

(1) See 8 Vin. Ab. 312. pl. 29; and Hampshire v. Pierce, 2 Ves. 216., cited by Lawrence, J. 6 T. R. 678. See ante, p. 412.

jecture. And with regard to the other question respecting the rejection of evidence," added Lord Kenyon, "it was properly rejected; the supposed declarations having
*416 *been made by the testator, long before the will was made; but, had they been made at the time of making the will, I should have thought them admissible evidence (*a*)."

(*a*) Where a legacy was given to Samuel Powell, the son of Samuel Powell, who had two sons, one named William and the other Samuel, parol evidence was admitted to show that William was the person intended by the testator by the name of Samuel, the former being the grandson of the testator, who usually called him by the name of Samuel, but the latter being the son of Samuel Powell the elder by a second marriage, with whom the testator had no connexion or acquaintance whatever. *Powell* v. *Biddle*, 2 *Dall.* 70. In an action of ejectment to recover a lot in the military tract in the state of New-York, the plaintiff claimed under a patent to David Hungerford, and under an act of the legislature *for the relief of Daniel Hungerford*, which recited that letters patent had been issued in the name of David Hungerford, but the grant was intended for Daniel Hungerford, it was therefore enacted that the letters patent should be deemed to have vested the lot in Daniel Hungerford, in the same manner as if they had been issued in the name of the said Daniel. Evidence was given to show that Daniel Hungerford had served in the New-York line, and although described in the ballotting book as David H., yet that there was no other Hungerford than Daniel in the company to which he was described as belonging. The defendant showed the existence of a man of the name of David Hungerford, who served in the New-York line, and under whom he claimed: a verdict was found for the plaintiff, and a motion for a new trial was denied. Kent, Ch. J. in delivering the opinion of the court says: "If Daniel Hungerford was the soldier who belonged to that company and regiment, and no person of the name of David Hungerford was a soldier in that regiment, there must have been a misnomer in the christian name of the patentee. I think the evidence taken at the trial establishes the mistake; and the question is, whether that evidence was admissible, and if so, what is the legal effect of it? Here is no ambiguity on the face of the patent, but it is a latent ambiguity, and according to general rules the parties

If a clause in a deed, or will, or any other instrument, is so ambiguously or defectively expressed, that a court of law, which has to put a construction on the instrument, is

Latent ambiguity.

---

may go into extrinsic evidence to ascertain the grantee, and clear up the mistake in the soldier's name. Parol evidence has been admitted in the case of a will, to ascertain the person when two were of the same name, or when there had been a mistake of the christian name of the devisee. But with respect to deeds and grants the old general rule seems to have been that an omission or mistake of the christian name of the grantee rendered the grant void. Lord Coke, however holds, that a grant may sometimes be good, though the grantee's name of baptism be mistaken. (Co. Litt. 3. a.) Thus, if lands be given to Robert Earl of Pembroke, when his name is Henry, or to George Bishop of Norwich, when his name is John, the grant is still good, because there can be but one of that name and dignity. If then the patent in this case had designated the Hungerford intended, by specifying the regiment and company to which he belonged, at the time of his death, it might have been good, as being equally capable of being reduced to certainty. But the patent adds no description or demonstration to the name of the patentee. It is simply a patent of the lot to David Hungerford; and according to the rule which has been mentioned, the heirs of Daniel Hungerford cannot take under that patent, because their ancestor is not the patentee named. In all the cases which I have seen where there was a misnomer, there was some description connected with the name, and there was no other person who set up a title in competition, under the erroneous name; but here the defendant claims under one David Hungerford, and contends that he was the grantee, and a soldier in the line of this state; though the proof of the fact is extremely weak, and no proof was offered that he was a soldier in M'Kean's company, in the first regiment, or that he belonged to either of the two regiments of infantry for the use of whom the military bounty lands were appropriated. The verdict is to be considered as establishing the fact that Daniel was the soldier who served, and must have been the soldier intended. The grant then is either void by reason of the misnomer, or the parol proof supplies and corrects the mistake in the christian name of the soldier intended, and in either case, the lessors of the plantiff are entitled to recover." *Jackson* d. *Dick-*

unable to collect the intention of the party, evidence of the declaration of the party cannot be admitted to explain his intention, but the clause will be void on account of its

---

son & others v. *Stanley*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 133. In a subsequent case, which was also an action of ejectment for a lot in the military tract, the plaintiff gave in evidence letters patent to George Houseman; it was stated in the ballotting book that a man of the name of George Houseman, belonged to Wendell's company in the first regiment. The defendant offered to prove that no such man as George Houseman was enlisted or served in Wendell's company, and that a man of the name of George Hosmer did enlist and serve in that company, and that the patent was issued in the name of George Houseman by mistake, and that George Hosmer was the soldier entitled to the patent and intended thereby. This evidence having been rejected by the judge, a verdict was found for the plaintiff, and on a motion for a new trial it was held by a majority of the court that the patent could not be avoided in a collateral action, but that if there was a mistake, the proper remedy was by scire facias, or other proceedings for that purpose in chancery. Platt, J. in delivering the opinion of the majority of the judges observed that this case was distinguishable from that of Jackson v. Stanley in two respects. 1. The alleged mistake here is in the surname, and not merely in the christian name of the grantee; 2. The state has not in this case, interfered to assert its right by a new legislative grant to the opposite claimant. "The rule, says the learned judge, is indisputable, that parol evidence cannot be received to vary or contradict a written instrument of clear, certain, and unequivocal import. A latent ambiguity may be explained by parol proof, in order to elucidate and explain written words of doubtful sense, as if a grant be made to John Smith, and there be several persons of that name, parol evidence is admissible to explain which of the persons bearing the same name was intended. So, parol evidence would be admissible to prove, that George Houseman and George Hosmer are the same person. But certainly it is not explaining a latent ambiguity, to prove that a grant to George Houseman, a real person, was intended for another person of the name of George Hosmer. Such an extension of the rule would destroy the security of written conveyances. If a different person may be substituted by parol proof, for the person certainly

uncertainty (*b*). In many cases an apparent uncertainty may be removed by collecting the general intention from other passages in the writing, so as to make the whole consistent; or by a reference to some event, or some other

---

described as grantee in a deed, there is no other essential part of the deed which might not be altered in the same way. Such a relaxation in the established rules of evidence, would defeat the spirit and policy of the statute of frauds, which requires conveyances of land should be in writing." Thompson, Ch. J. dissented on the ground that this case could not be distinguished from that of Jackson v. Stanley. Speaking of that case he says; "if, under the patent, the title was vested in David Hungerford, it was not, nor could be pretended, that the legislature could devest him of his title, and give it to Daniel Hungerford, the person really intended as the patentee. The patent to David must be first got rid of, before the act of the legislature could take effect, and so it was considered by the court. Notwithstanding there was a person of the same name with the patentee, who claimed title to the land, the court said the patent was void, because he was not the person intended, and that it was competent to show this by parol evidence." *Jackson* d. *Houseman* v. *Hart*, 12 *Johns. Rep.* 77. A. by a written contract agreed to receive of B. 60 shares of the Hudson bank, on which 10 dollars per share had been paid, and to deliver B. his note for 667 dollars and pay him the balance in cash; and also, to pay 5 per cent. advance. The question was whether it was competent for B. to explain by parol, whether the 5 per cent. advanced on the shares, was to be on the sum then actually paid in, or on the nominal amount of the shares. It was held that this was a latent ambiguity, and that the parol evidence was admissible. *Cole* v. *Wendell*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 116.

(*b*) In *Dinkle's Lessee* v. *Marshall*, 3 *Binney* 587., it was held that declarations of the grantor, at and immediately before the sealing and delivery of a deed, are admissible to show that he did not intend to convey what might nevertheless be included within the description of the deed. In *Drum* v. *Lessee of Simpson*, 6 *Binney* 482., Tilghman, Ch. J. says that it had been long settled in the Sup. Court of Pennsylvania that parol evidence might be received to prove what passed before and at the time of the execution of

writing, or some medium of explanation, adverted to in the instrument. But when, after comparing the several parts of a written instrument, and collecting all the lights which the writing itself supplies, the intention of the parties still appears to be uncertain, parol evidence of their intention is not admissible. "Ambiguitas patens," Lord Bacon (1), (that is, an ambiguity apparent on the deed or instrument,) "cannot be helped by averment; and the reason is, because the law will not couple and mingle matter of specialty, which is of the higher account, with matter of averment, which is of inferior account in law: for, that were to make all deeds hollow, and subject to averment, and so in effect to make that pass without deed, which, the law appoints, shall not pass but by deed. It holds generally," he adds, "that all ambiguity of words within the deed, and not out of the deed, may be helped by construction, or in some cases by election, but never by averment, but rather shall make the deed void for uncertainty (*c*)."

And in the case of a will, if any devise is expressed doubtfully and with uncertainty, the only construction, which it
* 417 *is capable of receiving, is by comparing it with the other parts of the will; the declarations of the testator are not admissible to remove the apparent ambiguity, or to explain his intention. As, for example, if the devise is to "one of the sons of J. S.," who has several sons, such an uncertainty in the description of the devisee cannot be explained by parol proof (1). So in a case, where the testator made dispositions in his will to several persons, among others to his wife and niece, who were the only women mentioned in the will, and then devised "to her" a particular estate for

(1) Bac. Elem. rule 23.

(1) 2 Vern. 624.

---

the deed, if the party offering the evidence alleges fraud or mistake in the transaction. Et vide *Hurst's Lessee* v. *Kirkbridge*, 1 *Binney* 616. *Reichart* v. *Castator*, 5 *Binney* 109.

(*c*) Vide 6 *Mass. Rep.* 440.

life, the question was whether parol evidence could be admitted, to show which of the two was intended; the Lord Chancellor refused to receive it, on the ground that it would tend to put it in the power of witnesses to make wills for testators; the court held, that though the term "her" was relative, it was to be referred in this case to the wife, because in other parts of the will it seemed to relate to the wife; but expressly excluded the parol evidence offered to explain the will (2). However, courts of law as well as courts of equity will admit evidence of the situation and circumstances of the parties, for the purpose of assisting them in putting a construction on wills, that are not clearly expressed; as, in the case of Masters v. Masters (3), where the testator, after having bequeathed a legacy to the poor of two hospitals in Canterbury, (naming them,) bequeathed another sum in his codicil "to all and every the hospitals," the second bequest was adjudged not to be void for uncertainty, but to have been intended for all the hospitals in Canterbury, as it appeared in evidence, that the testator lived in Canterbury, and had in his will taken notice of two hospitals there (*a*). But evidence of the value of the estate devised, or of the amount of the testator's property, will not be admitted in order to raise an argument in favour of a *particular construction; whatever may be the amount, the general rule of construction must prevail (1) (*b*). * 418

(2) Castleton v. Turner; cited 2 Ves. 217.

(3) 1 P. Wms. 420. See also Harris v. Bishop of Lincoln, 2 P. Wms. 135. Sir J. Eden v. Earl of Bute, 3 Bro. Parl. C. 79. Doe v. Burt, 1 T. R. 701. Selwood v. Mildmay, 3 Ves. jun. 310. 6 Ves. 396. 13 Ves. 174. 15 Ves. 514. Herbert v. Reid, 16 Ves. 481.

(1) Doe dem. Handson v. Fyldes, Cowp. 833. Standen v. Standen, 2 Ves. jun. 593. Richardson v. Edmonds, 7 T. R. 635.

(*a*) Vide *Doe* d. *Barnes* v. *Provoost*, 4 *Johns. Rep.* 63.

(*b*) The testator, Murray, having amassed a large property in the East Indies, shipped goods on board of a vessel at Calcutta, which were consigned to the defendants: and also engaged his passage for America on board of a vessel belonging to the defendants. Before the vessel sailed the testator had a fall from a horse, and was so much injured that his life was despaired of, and he in con-

A blank in a will, for the devisee's name, is an instance of apparent ambiguity, and parol evidence cannot be admitted to show what person's name the testator intended to insert (2). But on a bequest to a person, whose surname was mentioned, with a blank left for the Christian name, the party who claimed the legacy, was allowed not only to prove acts of kindness and constant affection on the part of the deceased, but to show further that the testator had said "he would provide for him, and that he had left him something by his will (3);" and in another case, where only one initial appeared in the will, (the bequest being "to Mrs. G.," without any other description,) the Chancellor referred it to the master to receive evidence, to show who was the person intended to be described by that initial (4). The distinction between these cases is, that in the former there is no description whatever of a devisee, and whether the testator had selected any person as the object of his devise is entirely uncertain on the face of the will; but in

(2) Baylis v. The Attorney-General, 2 Atk. 239. Castledon v. Turner, 3 Atk. 257. Hunt v. Hort, 3 Bro. Ch. C. 311.

(3) Price v. Page, 4 Ves. jun. 680.

(4) Abbot v. Massie, 3 Ves. jun. 148.

---

sequence made his will, and soon after died. The will contained the following clause: "All my property which has been remitted home by me from this country to America, I desire may remain in the hands of those to whom I sent it, for their own use." A subsequent clause in the will was, "the property now going to America, I do not consider as belonging to any person." In an action by the administrator cum testamento annexo, against the consignees of the goods to recover their value, the defendants set up a claim to the property under the above clauses in the will, and offered in evidence parol declarations of the testator subsequent to making the will, that he intended the property should be theirs as a compensation for the loss and expense which they had sustained in fitting the cabin of the ship for his accommodation, and rejecting passengers and freight: the evidence having been admitted at the trial, on a motion for a new trial it was held inadmissible. *Richards* v. *Dutch*, 8 *Mass. Rep.* 506.

the two last cases, the testator has given some description, and though it would appear too slight and general for the information of strangers, yet to persons well acquainted with the testator, it might be sufficiently full and distinct; in the first of these two cases, the testator might not have known the Christian name; in the other, the description in the will might have been the only one by which the testator used to designate the claimant (*b*).

When a blank is left in a written agreement, which need not have been reduced into writing, and would have been equally binding, whether written or unwritten, *(as, if the agreement were to deliver goods to the amount of less than ten pounds, and a blank were left for the quantity of goods to be delivered,) in such a case, it is presumed, in an action for the non-performance of the contract, parol evidence might be admitted to show the quantity, for which the parties agreed; for a memorandum in writing was not required in this case by the statute of frauds, and the proposed evidence would not contradict any part of the written agreement, but merely supply an omission, where nothing need have been expressed. And where a written instrument, which was made professedly to record a fact, is produced as evidence of that fact which it purports to record, and a blank appears in a material part, the omission may be supplied by other proof. Thus, if a bishop's register were to be produced in evidence, for the purpose of showing a presentation by a patron, under whom the plaintiff claims, and on the production of the register a blank should appear in the place where the patron's name is usually inserted, the presentation might be proved in some other way (1); as, by a witness, who was present, and heard the presentation. So, in the case of a surrender of a copyhold by a steward, if there is any mistake in the entry, that is only matter of fact, *-419

(1) Bishop of Meath v. Lord Belfield, 1 Wils. 215.

(*b*) A blank left in an award for a name was allowed to be supplied by parol proof. *Lynn* v. *Risberg*, 2 *Dall.* 180.

and the courts of law will in that case admit an averment, that there was a mistake either as to the lands or uses (2).

Usage to explain ancient charters, &c.

In the construction of written instruments, words are to be understood according to their common and general acceptation at the time when the instrument was made (3), and with reference to the nature of the subject. If the language in ancient charters is become obscure from its antiquity, or the construction is doubtful, the constant and immemorial usage under the instrument may be resorted *420 *to for the purpose of explanation (1), though it can never be admitted to control or contradict the express provisions of the instrument. Such continued usage is a strong practical exposition of the meaning of the parties (*a*). Even in the case of an act of parliament, universal usage has been referred to as a proper expositor, where the language is doubtful (2). Lork Coke, in commenting on the statute of Glocester, says, that when any claimed before the justices in eyre any franchises by ancient charter, if the words were general, and a continual possession was pleaded of the franchises claimed, or if the claim was by old and obscure words, and the party in pleading expounded them to the court and averred continual possession according to that exposition, the entry was ever *inquiratur super possessionem et usum;* and this, adds Lord Coke, "I have observed in divers records of those eyres, agreeably to that

(2) Towers v. Moor, 2 Vern. 98.

(3) Vaugh. Rep. 169. Com. Dig. tit. Parols, (A).

(1) R. Varlo, Cowp. 248. Gape v. Handley, 3 T. R. 288. n. R. v. Bellringer, 4 T. R. 810. R. v. Osbourne, 4 East 333. Bailiff, &c. of Tewkesbury v. Bricknell, 2 Taunt. 120. R. v. Mayor of St. Alban's, 12 East 559. R. v. Mayor, &c. of Stratford upon Avon, 14 East 348. R. v. Mayor, &c. of Chester, 1 Maule & Selw. 101.

(2) Sheppard v. Gosnold, Vaugh. 169., and see R. v. Scott, 3 T. R. 604.

(*a*) When the language of a deed admits of but one construction, and is clear and pertinent, it cannot be controlled by any different exposition to be derived from the practice under it. *Cortelyou* v. *Van Brundt*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 357.

old rule, *optimus interpres rerum usus* (3)." And the uniform course of modern authorities fully establishes the rule, that however general the words of ancient grants may be, they are to be construed by evidence of the manner in which the thing has been always possessed and used (4). Thus, on an information to set aside an election to a perpetual curacy, it appeared that the impropriate rectory, out of which the curacy arose, had been granted in trust for the use of the parishioners and inhabitants of a parish for ever; on the part of the relators it was insisted, that the right of nomination to the vicarage ought to be confined to inhabitants paying scot and lot, or to persons paying to church and poor; and on the part of the defendants, that it extended to all house-keepers in general: Lord Hardwicke, in delivering his judgment, said, "that some sort of limitation was allowed by both sides *to have been put by usage on the liberality of the grant, * 421
and that in the construction of ancient grants and deeds there is no better way of construing them, than by usage; and *contemporanea expositio* is the best way to go by;" and since in this case there was evidence of house-keepers having constantly voted, Lord Hardwicke held, that this usage ought to prevail (1).

Nor does it make any difference with respect to the admissibility of evidence of immemorial usage, for the purpose of explaining and construing ancient instruments, whether the instrument be a charter granted by the crown, or merely a private deed. Thus, in the case of Withnell v. Gartham (2), where the question was on the construction of an ancient deed, granting the power of appointing a schoolmaster to the minister and churchwardens of a parish, whether all the churchwardens must concur, or whether the act of the majority was sufficient, and the jury found the usage to be in favour of the appointment by a majority, Lord Kenyon, in

(3) 2 Inst. 282.
(4) Weld v. Hornby, 7 East 199. R. v. Osbourne, 4 East 327.
(1) The Attorney-General v. Parker and others, 3 Atk. 576. The Attorney-General v. Foster, 10 Ves. jun. 335.
(2) 6 T. R. 383.

speaking of the usage and adverting to an argument which had been insisted on, (namely, that the Court ought to reject the evidence of usage, because the instances proved were not as ancient as the deed, and also because usage cannot be let in to explain a private deed,) said, that if the first reason were sufficient to reject the usage, it would be difficult to know how far such an objection might extend. In many cases a party undertakes to prove a custom from the time of legal memory, but that proof is generally established by evidence of facts done at a much later period. And as to the second objection, Lord Kenyon said, there was no difference in that respect between a private deed and a king's charter; in both cases, evidence of usage might be given to expound them. So, in a late case (3), where, in an action for entering the plaintiff's close, the defendant pleaded, that the close was copyhold, and justified
* 422 *under a grant from the lord and by the command of the copyholder, in support of this plea the defendant proved that the person (under whom he justified) and all those whose estate he had, for a long course of years had constantly taken the forecrop of grass and pasturage from the close, and then by court rolls of the manor proved admissions to a copyhold tenement "of three acres of meadow," (which was admitted to be the close in question,) but every other benefit of the land, except the forecrop, had been enjoyed by those from whom the plaintiff claimed; Mr. Justice Heath, who tried the cause, was of opinion, "that, although the terms of the surrender and admission were sufficiently comprehensive to pass the soil and freehold, yet, as in ancient grants the legal import might be restrained by long and concomitant usage, which might be taken as evidence of the original intent of the parties in making the grant, so here the grant might be restrained by the received usage, and only pass the forecrop, which would not carry the soil." And the Court of King's Bench agreed in this construction of the written evidence. The terms of the ad-

(3) Stammers v. Dixon, 7 East 200.

missions, they thought, were not incompatible with the plaintiff's right, and might receive a construction conformable to the usage.

Thus it appears, that the words of an instrument, in themselves conveying a general right to an estate, may in certain cases be limited and restrained by the manner in which the estate has for a length of time been actually enjoyed. But in the construction of a legal instrument, where the question is, whether a party is bound by his covenant to do a certain act, (as, for example, to grant a renewal of a lease,) courts of law will not consider the acts of the parties, or their interpretation of the instrument. In one case, indeed, where it was doubtful whether a covenant for renewal extended to a perpetual renewal, and the parties had renewed four times successively, the Court of King's Bench held, that the legal effect was a perpetual renewal, on the ground that the parties them-
*selves had, by their own acts, put a construction on the * 423
covenant, and that the Court could not say the contrary (1). But this case has been frequently disapproved of (2), and a different rule is now established. "It cannot be a legal mode of construction, (said the Master of the Rolls, in a case of this kind,) that a party who has done an act, which he was not bound to do, or from a mistake, should therefore be bound for ever without the power of retracting (3)."

Sect. II.

Of the Admissibility of Parol Evidence to vary or discharge Written Instruments.

It is a general rule of law, that parol evidence cannot be admitted to contradict, add to, or vary, the terms of a

(1) Cooke v. Booth, Cowp. 819.
(2) Baynham v. Guy's Hospital, 3 Ves. jun. 298. Eaton v. Lyons, 3 Ves. jun. 694. Iggulden v. May, 9 Ves. jun. 333. 2 Bos. & Pull. New Rep. 452. S. C.
(3) Moore v. Foley, 6 Ves. jun. 238.

will, deed, or other written instrument. First, with respect to wills;

Wills.

The statutes of the 32d and 34th of Henry VIII., which gave the power of devising lands by a last will and testament in writing, must clearly have intended, that whatever is effectual and to the purpose, ought to be in writing and sufficient without the aid of words not written; and therefore no parol evidence of the testator's intention can be admitted to control or enlarge (*a*) the terms of the will (4). An additional reason for this rule is supplied by the statute of frauds, which enacts, that all devises of lands, &c. must be in writing, and are not revocable except by some other will or codicil, or by some act, as cancelling, &c. With regard to wills of personal property, it is evident from the 22d section of the statute of frauds, that no unwritten declarations of the testator can be admitted to vary any bequest; for that section enacts, "that no will in writing
* 424 *concerning goods, chattels, or personal estate, shall be repealed, and that no clause shall be altered or changed, by any words or will by word of mouth only, except the same be in the life time of the testator committed to writing, and after the writing read to the testator, and allowed by him, and proved to be so done, by at least three witnesses (1)."

2. Parol evidence is not admissible to contradict, or vary, or add to, the terms of a deed (2). "It would be inconvenient," says Lord Coke, "that matters in writing made by advice and on consideration, and which finally import the certain truth of the agreement of the parties, should be controlled by an averment of parties to be prov-

(4) Brett v. Rigden, Plowd. Com. 345. Lord Cheyney's case, 5 Rep. 68. Bertie v. Lord Falkland, 1 Salk. 231. 2 Vern. 333. S. C.

(1) Brown v. Selwin, Forrest. 240. Lowfield v. Stoneham, 2 Stra. 1261. Cambridge v. Rous, 8 Ves. jun. 22.

(2) Countess of Rutland's case, 5 Rep. 26. Buckler v. Millerd, 2 Ventr. 107. Tinney v. Tinney, 3 Atk. 8. Haynes v. Hate, 1 H. Black. 659.

(*a*) Vide *Jackson* d. *Van Vechten & others* v. *Sill & others*, 11 *Johns. Rep.* 201. *Spalding* v. *Huntington*, 1 *Day* 8.

ed by the uncertain testimony of slippery memory; and it would be dangerous to purchasers and all others in such cases, if such nude averments against matter in writing should be admitted (*a*)." In an action of debt therefore, on a bond conditioned to pay a sum of money on a certain day, the defendant cannot show that the bond was intended as an indemnity against another bond (3).

In an action on a bond a party will not be permitted to show a condition different from that expressed in the bond (*b*); and a conveyance cannot be averred by parol to be to another use or intent than that expressed in the conveyance. But there is a difference in this respect between an use and a consideration. It is an established rule, that a party may aver another consideration, which is consistent with the consideration expressed; but no averment can be made contrary to, or inconsistent with (*c*), that expressed in the deed (4). Thus, if a deed of bargain and sale is expressed generally to be made "for divers good considerations," it may be *averred, that the bargainee gave * 425

(3) Mease v. Mease, Cowp. 47.
(4) 2 Roll. Abr. 786. (N), pl. 1. Cromwell's case, 2 Rep. 76. Bedell's case, 7 Rep. 39. Mildmay's case, 1 Rep. 176. Lord

---

(*a*) Vide *O'Hara* v. *Hall*, 4 *Dall.* 341. *Paine* v. *M'Intier*, 1 *Mass. Rep.* 69. *Skinner* v. *Henderson*, 1 *Root* 253. *Tabb & others* v. *Archer and others*, 3 *Hen. & Mun.* 399. *Northrop* v. *Speary*, 1 *Day* 23. *Atkinson* v. *Ex'rs of Scott*, 1 *Bay* 307. *post.* 427. n. (a) 10 *Mass. Rep.* 244. *Snowden* v. *Hemming*, 1 *Dall.* 83. *Field* v. *Biddle*, 2 *Dall.* 171. *M'Minn* v. *Owen*, 2 *Dall.* 173. *Zantzinger* v. *Ketch*, 4 *Dall.* 142. *Stubbs v. Burwell*, 2 *Hen. & Mun.* 536. *Townsend* v. *Weld*, 8 *Mass. Rep.* 146.

(*b*) So, an averment that the sum stated in the condition of a bond, was erroneously inserted for another sum, is inadmissible. *United States* v. *Thompson et al. Rep. C. C. U. S. First Circt.* 388.

(*c*) So, if a bargain and sale express a consideration of money, no averment lies against the recital. *Wilt* v. *Franklin*, 1 *Binney* 502.

money or other valuable consideration (1). That such an averment may be taken, says Lord Coke, which stands with the deed, although it be not expressly comprised in the deed, is proved by the case of Villers and Beamont (2), where the consideration in a deed of bargain and sale of lands was stated to be a sum of money, but it was averred and found by the jury, that the indenture was made "as well in consideration of marriage (to make it a jointure and bar-dower) as of the said sum of money;" and it was adjudged, that, although there was a particular consideration mentioned in the deed, yet an averment might be made of another consideration, which stood with the indenture, and which was not contrary to it*. A fortiori, adds Lord
* 426 Coke, the averment *may be made, where no certain con-

(1) 2 Roll. Ab. 786. (N). 1 Rep. 176. cited (4), ante, p. 424.
(2) 2 Dyer 146. a. Vernon's case, 4 Rep. 3. S. P. And see Craythorne v. Swinburne, 14 Ves. 170.

* In the case of Villers and Beamont, above cited, (2 Dyer, 146. a.) an elaborate argument is to be found in support of the position, that "where a consideration is expressed in a deed of gift or grant, no other cause can be averred; but if no cause is expressed, that a cause may then be averred out of the deed." The report adds, "that three Judges argued to the contrary, and that the effect of that which is found by the assignment of, 'as well in consideration of the said marriage, &c. as of the sum,' &c. *is contained within the indenture*, and *so* their finding is not contrary to it." In the case of Peacock v. Monk, (1 Ves. 128.) Lord Hardwicke makes the same distinction. A bill in that case was filed, claiming the benefit of a trust under a deed, and the point was, whether the plaintiff could prove a valuable consideration, as no consideration was expressed in the deed. Lord Hardwicke held that the proof ought to be read. "It differed," he said, "from the common case, upon which the objection is founded; for, to be sure, where any consideration is mentioned, as of love and affection only, if it is not said also, 'for other considerations,' you cannot enter into proof of any other; the reason is, because it would be *contrary* to the deed; for when the deed says, it is in consideration of such a particular thing, that imports the whole consideration, and is negative to any other. But this is a middle case, there being no consideration at all in the deed." All the authorities agree, that, where the deed is not impeached for fraud or other illegal matter, no consideration can be averred or proved *contrary* to that expressed in the deed; and, further, the cases referred to in the text appear to have established, that it is not considered to be contrary to or inconsistent with a deed, to prove another consideration in addition to the consideration expressed.

sideration is mentioned, but the deed is general "for divers good considerations;" for then the averment (that the bargainee gave money, &c.) is but an explanation and particularizing of the general words of the deed, which include every manner of consideration; and in all these cases, the matter so averred is traversable and issuable (*a*). So, where no consideration is expressed in the deed, a party, claiming the benefit of a trust under the deed, may prove a valuable consideration (1). And in a late case, where the question was, whether a settlement had been gained by the purchase of an estate within the statute 9 G. 1. c. 7. s. 5., parol evidence was adjudged to be admissible to show, that the parties, after having agreed upon twenty-eight pounds as the purchase money, (which was the consideration expressed in the deed of conveyance,) made a subsequent unwritten agreement before the execution of the deed, that the consideration should be thirty pounds, and that the latter sum was actually paid (2). Here the object of the proposed evidence was not to contradict the indenture, but to ascertain an independent collateral fact, namely, whether thirty pounds had been bona fide paid as a consideration for the purchase of the estate, upon which fact the settlement would depend.

The authorities which have been mentioned, appear to establish the rule, that, although a consideration is expressed, some other additional consideration may be shown, not inconsistent with the former. In one case, indeed, namely, where a deed has been impeached for fraud, the party charged will not be allowed to prove any other con-

(1) Peacock v. Monk, 1 Ves. 128.

(2) R. v. Scammonden, 3 T. R. 474., cited per Cur. in Rich v. Jackson, 6 Ves. jun. 337. n.

(*a*) In *Maigley* v. *Hauer*, 7 *Johns. Rep.* 341, the Court say, "it is a settled rule, that where the consideration is expressly stated in a deed, and it is not said also, *and for other considerations*, you cannot enter into proof of any other, for that would be contrary to the deed."

sideration, in support of the instrument. Thus, where a bill was filed to set aside as fraudulent a conveyance, expressed to be made in consideration of an annuity, and on the part of the defendants it was objected, that the grantor
* 427 *of the estate had often declared, "he would rather that his kinsman, one of the defendants, should have the estate in consideration of this annuity than any other person for a more valuable consideration, and that he was willing to give the premises to his kinsman;" the Master of the Rolls, after stating that the deed and the answer had put the defence on another ground, declared, that it would be of mischievous consequence and liable to the danger of perjury, which the statute of frauds intended to prevent, to suffer parol evidence to prove blood and kindred to have been the consideration of this conveyance (1).

The general rule then is, that a party to a deed will be precluded from showing a condition or consideration contrary to what is expressed in the deed (*a*). An exception,

(1) Clarkson v. Hanway, 2 P. Wms. 203. 2 Schoal. & Lef. 501.

(*a*) Parol evidence is inadmissible to show that a lease, executed in the name of, and reserving a rent to, one person, was intended for the benefit of another. *Jackson* d. *Bonnel & Goodyear* v. *Foster*, 12 *Johns. Rep.* 488. Where a deed expresses the quantity of acres in a tract of land, and the consideration is paid according to the quantity expressed, parol evidence is inadmissible to show that on actual measurement there was a deficiency in the land, and an action for money had and received cannot be maintained to recover back part of the consideration in proportion to the alleged deficiency, but the party must resort to a court of equity. *Howes* v. *Barker*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 506. Parol evidence is inadmissible to show that an exception was intended to be made of part of the land granted. *Snyder's Lessee* v. *Snyder*, 6 *Binney* 483. Where a deed is executed to two or more persons without stating the proportions in which they are to hold, they take in equal proportions, and parol evidence is inadmissible to prove the consideration respectively paid, in order thereby to determine their proportions. *Treadwell & another* v. *Bulkely & another*, 4 *Day* 395. Parol evidence is inadmissible to show that in a release of

however, is always to be made, where the consideration has been illegal, as for simony, usury, compounding of felony, &c. (2); thus, in an action of debt upon a bond, the defendant may plead, that the bond was given for an usurious consideration, though a different and a legal consideration may be recited. And when fraud is imputed, the party which complains of the fraud, may prove any consideration, however contrary to the averment in the deed, to show the fraudulent nature of the transaction (3). Thus, where the considerations mentioned in the deed were ten thousand pounds, and natural love and affection, the lords commissioners of the great seal directed an issue, to try whether natural love and affection formed any part of the consideration, the estates which were conveyed by the deed being worth thirty thousand pounds. On an appeal this was confirmed; and the jury, on the trial of this issue, finding that natural love and affection constituted no part of the consideration, the deed was afterwards set aside by the court of chancery (4). So, when the question is, whether a *person has gained a settlement in a parish by purchasing an estate, within the statute 9 G. 1. c. 7. s. 5., evidence is admissible to show, that less than thirty pounds was the * 428

(2) Buckler v. Millerd, 2 Ventr. 107. Collins v. Blantern, 2 Wils. 347.
(3) Bull. N. P. 173.
(4) Filmer v. Gott, 4 Bro. Parl. C. 234., 2d edit.

---

all demands, a particular debt was not intended to be released. *Pierson* v. *Hooker*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 68. Parol evidence is inadmissible to show that it was intended to submit matters to arbitration not specified in the bond of submission. *Sessions* v. *Barfield*, 2 *Bay* 94. Parol evidence is inadmissible to vary the boundaries stated in a deed. *Jackson* d. *Putnam & others* v. *Bowen*, 1 *Caines' Rep.* 358. In many of the states, however, it appears that in questions of boundary, the rule of law prohibiting the admission of parol evidence is either greatly relaxed, or entirely disregarded. *Mageehan* v. *Lessee of Adams*, 2 *Binney* 109. *Baker* v. *Seekright*, 1 *Hen. & Mun.* 177. *Loften* v. *Heath*, 2 *Hayw.* 347. *White* v. *Eagan*, 1 *Bay* 247. *Middleton ads. Perry*, 2 *Bay* 539 Et vide *Storer* v. *Freeman*, 6 *Mass. Rep.* 435.

consideration, though the deed of conveyance may express a greater consideration (*a*); for that act of parliament says, that no person shall gain a settlement, &c. by virtue of any purchase, unless the consideration for such purchase shall amount to the sum of thirty pounds bona fide paid (1). And for the purpose of setting aside a will on the ground of fraud, parol evidence may be given of what passed at the time of the testator's signing, and what the testator said; as in the case of Small v. Allen (2), where it was proved, that the testator at the time of the execution asked, whether the contents of the will were the same as those of a former will, to which he was answered in the affirmative, when in fact the contents were different (*b*). So, where indentures or other writings are not available in evidence, unless the consideration paid or contracted for is truly stated, it may be proved that a greater sum than is mentioned was actually paid, or that the writing does not contain the whole of the agreement, but that some of the terms of the agreement

(1) R. v. Mattingley, 2 T. R. 12. (2) 3 T. R. 147.
R. v. Olney, 1 Maule & Selw. 387.

(*a*) So, the appellants from an order of removal may prove by parol, that no part of the consideration expressed in the deed to the pauper had been paid by him. The court say, "it is a general rule that parties and privies are estopped from contradicting a written agreement by parol proof, but the rule does not extend to strangers, who have an interest in investigating and knowing the real truth of the case." *Overseers of New Berlin* v. *Overseers of Norwich*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 229.

(*b*) The declarations of a testator before and at the time of making a will, and afterwards, if so near as to be a part of the *res gestæ*, are admissible to show fraud in obtaining it: but not declarations at any distance of time after the will has been executed, especially where the will has always been in the testator's possession. *Smith* v. *Fenner*, *Rep. C. C. U. S. First Circt.* 170. Previous declarations were admitted to show that the grantor instead of executing a deed supposed that he was executing a will. *Jones* v. *Robertson*, 2 *Mun.* 187.

were omitted for the purpose of evading the provisions of the stamp acts. In these and similar cases the general reason against admitting parol evidence will not apply; the danger is, not, that the admission of such evidence would introduce uncertainty or fraud, but, that fraud would be assisted by its exclusion, the whole object of the evidence being to expose and defeat a secret fraud (*c*).

As a deed takes effect from the time of delivery, not from the time of the date, it may be proved to have been delivered either before or after the day when it purports to have been made (*d*). In an action of debt, therefore, upon a bond, the plaintiff may declare on a bond bearing date on a certain day, and prove the delivery on another day (3), *or may state in his pleading, that the deed was indented, * 429
made, and concluded, on a different day from that on which the deed itself professes to have been indented and concluded (1).

Extrinsic evidence may sometimes be admitted to establish a customary right, appendant or consequent to other rights established by a deed, though such customary right is not expressed in the deed, provided that it is not inconsistent with any of the stipulations. Thus, it may be shown, that a heriot is due by custom on the death of a tenant for life, though not expressed in the lease (2). So, a lessee by deed may be entitled to an away-going crop by the custom of the country, though no such right is reserved by the deed. This was determined in the case of Wigglesworth v. Dallison (3), which was an action of trespass for cutting down corn, which the plaintiff claimed as his away-going crop, after the expiration of a lease by deed. The jury found

(3) Goddard's case, 2 Rep. 4. b.
(1) Stone v. Bale, 3 Lev. 348. Hall v. Cazenove, 4 East 477.
(2) Per Cur. in White v. Sayer, Palm. 211.
(3) 1 Doug. 201.

(*c*) Vide *Bliss* v. *Thompson*, 4 *Mass. Rep.* 488.

(*d*) Vide *Fox's Lessee* v. *Palmer*, 2 *Dall.* 214. *Jackson* d. *Griswold* v. *Bard*, 4 *Johns. Rep.* 230. *Jackson* d. *Hardenberg & others* v. *Schoonmaker*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 230.

the existence of the custom; and it was afterwards moved, in arrest of judgment, that such a custom was repugnant to the deed; and to that effect a case was cited, which had been determined ten years before by Mr. Justice Yates. But the court of King's Bench held, after a full argument, and taking time to consider, that the custom was not repugnant. They considered such a customary right as consequential to the taking, in the same manner as a heriot may be due by custom, though not mentioned in the grant or lease. And the judgment of the court of King's Bench on this point was afterwards affirmed, on a writ of error, by the unanimous opinion of the court of Exchequer-chamber (*a*).

But no proof will be admitted of such a custom as would vary or add to the stipulations expressed or necessarily implied in the lease. In the case of White v. Sayer (4), a
* 430 *custom for a lord of a manor to have common of pasture in all the lands of his tenants for life or years was held void and against law, "for that it is part of the thing demised," and consequently the custom would be contrary to the lease. And in Doe on the demise of Strickland v. Spence (1), it having been observed, among other things, in argument, that "the custom of the country might be let in as evidence of the holding where no express contract appeared, (though it could not govern the case then before the court)," Lord Ellenborough, C. J. observed, that "the agreement to quit *according to the time of entry* is no more than the law would have implied, if it had not been so expressed;" and Mr. Justice Le Blanc added, that "the custom of the country would not make the tenant quit at a

(4) Palm. 211.
(1) 6 East 122.
(2) 2 Black. Rep. 1225.

(*a*) So, in Pennsylvania a lessee for years may give evidence of the general custom of the state, by which tenants are entitled to the away-going crop, although no such right were given by the lease. *Stultz* v. *Dickey*, 5 *Binney* 285.

different time from that at which he entered;" from which it may be properly inferred, that when a lease has expressly fixed the time of entry, it implies so strongly and necessarily the time of quitting, that a custom cannot be set up to establish a different time of quitting, without contradicting the lease.

Yet, in the case of Doe on the demise of Dagget v. Snowden (2), the court of Common Pleas are reported to have said, that, in a lease for years, if there is a taking from Old Lady-day, the custom of most countries would allow the lessee to enter on the arable land at Candlemas, to prepare it for Lent corn; and on the meadows not before May-day, when, in the northern counties, they are usually heyned in for hay. The point was not immediately before the court; but, considering this dictum as a decision, it may perhaps be understood to imply, that a general time of entry in a lease refers to what the court called in that case, and what has since been called (3), the *substantial* time of entry, that is to the time of entry on the principal subject of the demise; that *this does not necessarily involve the time of entry on the subordinate or accessary subjects of demise; that with respect to the latter, therefore, a lease, which mentioned only a general time of entry, might be considered as silent; and, consequently, that evidence of custom might be admitted concerning these subordinate parts, without contradicting the terms of the lease. Even thus explained, however, the opinion of the court on this point seems to carry the principle of letting in proof of custom, to explain or vary written agreements, much farther than it has been admitted in any of the later decisions. * 431

Agreeably to the rules already mentioned, if, in a deed, a word of description is used, to which the law affixes a certain sense, it should seem, that evidence cannot be admitted to show, that, by the custom of the county, the

(2) 2 Black. Rep. 1225.
(3) See Doe v. Spence, 6 East 120. Doe v. Watkins, 7 East 551. Doe dem. Heapy v. Howard, 11 East 498.

word bears a sense different from its ordinary legal acceptation, unless where the deed expressly refers to such customary or peculiar sense. It was, indeed, ruled by Lord Kenyon, C. J. in a case at nisi prius (1), that, where the holding of certain lands in the city of Canterbury was from Michaelmas to Michaelmas, evidence was admissible to show that, by the custom of the county of Kent, all demises to hold "from Michaelmas" commenced at Old Michaelmas. But the authority of this case seems overturned by that of Doe on the demise of Spicer v. Lea (2). One of the questions there was, whether a lease from Michaelmas generally, which prima facie must be taken to mean New Michaelmas, was capable of being shown by extrinsic evidence, (such as the fact of a previous holding by the same tenant, and the understanding of the parties,) to mean Old Michaelmas. And to support the affirmative, the decision, already mentioned, of Lord Kenyon at nisi prius, was cited and relied on. But the court of King's Bench were of opinion, that no extrinsic evidence could be given to explain the time of holding stated in the deed, which
*432 *must be taken to be from New Michaelmas, since the act of parliament for altering the style; unless, as Lord Ellenborough, C. J. observed, there had been some reference in the deed itself to the prior holding. The same principle which governs the last case seems equally applicable to agreements to sell a certain number of acres of land generally, in which case the acres are to be computed, not according to the custom of the place, but by the statute measure (1); though, it must be confessed that, in some cases, where the number of acres may be thought to have been put rather by way of description than measurement, or where some other grounds (not, indeed, very definable) appeared for an exception to the general rule, they have been computed according to the general

(1) Forley dem. the Mayor of Canterbury v. Wood, cited in 11 East 313.

(2) 11 East 312.

(1) Wing v. Earle, Cro. El. 267. Morgan v. Tedcastle, Poph. 55. Waddy v. Newton, 8 Mod. 276.; and see 3 T. R. 274.

understanding of the country (2). And, from analogy to the rule above mentioned, on a sale of so many bushels of corn generally, (supposing, that a custom to sell by any other than the Winchester measure were not illegal and void (3),) it might, perhaps, be laid down, notwithstanding a dictum in an old case to the contrary (4), that the bushel must be intended to mean not the customary but the statute bushel (5). It appears, indeed, to be a general principle, that when a word is used which has a legal meaning, it must be understood in its legal acceptation (6).

Mercantile contracts.

3. Policies of insurance, though not specialty contracts, are within the same rule, and cannot be contradicted or varied by any unwritten agreement made by the parties previous to the time of signing the policy. Thus, in an early case, where, in an action on a policy of insurance from Archangel to Leghorn, the defendant attempted to show, that the agreement before the subscription of the *policy was, that the adventure should begin only from the Downs, the Court would not admit the evidence (1). Lord Chief Justice Pemberton in that case said, that policies were sacred things, and that a merchant should no more be allowed to go from what he had subscribed in them, than he, who subscribes a bill of exchange payable at such a day, shall be allowed to go from it, and say, it was agreed to be on condition, &c., when it may be, that the bill had been negotiated; for though neither of them are specialties, they are of great credit, and much for the support and advantage of trade (*a*).

* 433

(2) Morgan v. Tedcastle, Poph. 55. 2 Roll. Rep. 67. Sir J. Bruin's case, cited 6 Rep. 67. Some v. Taylor, Cro. El. 665.

(3) See R. v. Major, 4 T. R. 750. Master, &c. of St. Cross v. Lord Howard de Walden, 6 T. R. 338.

(4) Per Croke, J. in Floyd v. Bethill, 1 Roll. Rep. 420.

(5) Hockin v. Cooke, 4 T. R. 314.

(6) 6 T. R. 344.

(1) Kaines v. Knightly, Skin. 54. S. C., referred to in Bates v. Grabham, 2 Salk. 444., but mis-stated. Weston v. Emes, 1 Taunt. 115. Uhde v. Walters, 3 Campb. 16.

(*a*) Where the terms of a policy are clear and unequivocal, parol evidence will not be admitted to show a mistake, or to vary or explain them, except in those peculiar cases in which the usage

The same rule of course applies to charter-parties; for they are under seal. Therefore, in a nisi prius case, where a ship was chartered to wait for convoy at Portsmouth, Lord Kenyon would not suffer a parol agreement to be set up on the other side to substitute Corunna for Portsmouth (2). And this doctrine was sustained by the court of King's Bench in the case of White v. Parkin (3), though they held that it did not apply to that particular case.

Upon the same principle, in an action on a promissory note or bill of exchange, the defendant will not be allowed to give evidence of an agreement between him and the plaintiff, at the time of making the note, that it should be renewed, and that payment should not be demanded on its becoming due (4) (*b*). So, in the case of contracts of hiring between masters of ships and seamen, (though they are directed by statute to be in writing, under a penalty to be

(2) Leslie v. De la Torre, cited 12 East 583.

(3) 12 East 578.

(4) Hoare v. Graham, 3 Campb. 57. Hogg v. Snaith, 1 Taunt. 347.

---

of trade is allowed to be proved. *New-York Ins. Comp.* v. *Thomas*, 3 *Johns. Cas.* 1. *Mumford* v. *Hallett*, 1 *Johns. Rep.* 433. *Cheriot* v. *Barker*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 346. *Hogan* v. *Del. Ins. Co. C. C. U. S. P.* 1 *Condy's Marsh.* 345. *a. Vandervoort* v. *Smith*, 2 *Caines' Rep.* 155. *Marine Ins. Co. of Alexandria* v. *Hodgson*, 6 *Cranch* 206.

(*b*) So, where no time or place of payment is specified in a promissory note, parol evidence is inadmissible to show, that it was not intended to be payable immediately, or that it was to be paid at a place different from that in which it was made. *Thompson* v. *Ketcham*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 189. But as between the immediate parties to a negotiable instrument, or to the transfer of such instrument, it is competent for the defendant, notwithstanding the words *for value received*, to prove that no consideration had in fact passed from the plaintiff. *Pearson* v. *Pearson*, 7 *Johns. Rep.* 26. *Herrick* v. *Carman*, 10 *Johns. Rep.* 224. So, parol evidence is admissible to connect some trust or condition to a bill or note, not appearing on the face of the instrument. *Barker* v. *Prentiss*, 6 *Mass. Rep.* 430.

inflicted on the master, and it has not been decided that they are void, if unwritten,) still, when once reduced into writing, they cannot be varied or added to by parol. Thus, it was ruled in the court of Common Pleas, that a *mate in a slave-ship could not, on the ground of a verbal promise, claim the perquisite of the price of a negro slave beyond the wages due to him by certain written articles of agreement executed between the master, officers, and crew (1). * 434

However, it has been long determined by a variety of cases, that mercantile contracts, such as policies of insurance, charter-parties, and others of a like-nature, are to be construed conformably with the usage and custom of merchants (*a*). On mercantile contracts relating to insurance, said Lord Hardwicke, in a case before him, courts of law examine and hear witnesses, of what is the usage and understanding of merchants conversant therein; for they have a style peculiar to themselves, which is short, yet is understood by them, and must be the rule of construction (2). Thus, where an insurance was on a ship from London to the East Indies, warranted to depart with convoy, the Court held, that this clause of warranty must be construed according to the usage among merchants, that is, from such place where convoys are to be had, as from the Downs (3); so, where the insurance is on goods till landed, and the defence is, that the plaintiff has been guilty of unreasonable delay in landing, the question can only be decided by knowing the usual practice of the trade, with which every underwriter is supposed to be acquainted, whether the practice has been recently or long established (4) (*b*).

(1) White v. Wilson, 2 Bos. and Pull. 116.

(2) 1 Ves. 459. 2 Ves. 331. And see Uhde v. Walters, 3 Camph. 16.

(3) Lethulier's case, 2 Salk. 443.

(4) Noble v. Kennoway, 1 Doug. 510. Vallance v. Dewar, 1 Camp. 503.

(*a*) Vide *Parr* v. *Anderson*, 6 *East's Rep.* 202. *Urquhart* v. *Barnard*, 1 *Taunt.* 450. 457.

(*b*) Parol evidence was admitted to show that by the general usage among merchants and underwriters in New-York, the word

It has indeed been doubted by judges of the highest authority, whether the practice of admitting such evidence has not been carried to an inconvenient length. In the late case of Anderson v. Pitcher, (5), Lord Eldon, C. J. expressed himself in the following terms: "It is now too late to say,
* 435 *that this warranty is not to be expounded with due regard to the usage of trade. Perhaps it is to be lamented, that in policies of insurance, parties should not be left to express their own meaning by the terms of the instrument. This seems to have been the opinion of that great judge Lord Holt (1). It is true, indeed, that Lord Mansfield, who may be considered the establisher, if not the author, of a great part of this law, expressed himself thus: 'Wherever you render additional words necessary, and multiply them, you also multiply doubts and criticisms (2).' Whether, however, it be not true, that as much subtilty is raised by the application of usage to the construction of a contract, as by the introduction of additional words, might, if the matter were res integra, be reasonably questioned."

But though the usage of merchants, with reference to which the parties are supposed to contract, may be frequently resorted to for explaining or defining the terms of

(5) 2 Bos. & Pull. 168.
(1) Lethulier's case, 2 Salk. 443.
(2) Lilly v. Ewer, 1 Doug. 74.

---

roots in the memorandum of a policy was confined to such roots as are perishable in their own nature. *Coit and Pierpoint* v. *Commercial Ins. Co.* 7 *Johns. Rep.* 385. In an action against the owners of a vessel, for a quantity of gold and silver coin, taken by the master on freight, evidence of a custom of merchants, that the freight of money received by the master was his perquisite, and that he was to be personally liable on the contract, and not the owners was held, to be admissible. *Halsey* v. *Brown and others*, 8 *Day* 346. The true test of a commercial usage is, its having existed a sufficient length of time to have become generally known, and to warrant a presumption, that contracts are made in reference to it. *Smith & Stanley* v. *Wright*, 1 *Caines' Rep.* 43. *Trott* v. *Wood*, *Rep. C. C. U. S. First Circt.* 443.

a policy, it is not, therefore, to be supposed that this species of contract is not subject to the same rules of construction as are applicable to other written instruments. The same rules of construction apply to every kind of contract. The terms of a policy are to be understood in their plain, ordinary, and proper sense, unless they have generally, in respect to the subject-matter, as by the known usage of trade or the like, acquired a peculiar sense distinct from the popular sense of the words; or unless the context evidently points out that they must in the particular instance, and in order to effectuate the immediate intention of the parties, be understood in some other special and peculiar sense (3). Proof of usage is not admissible to contradict the plain unequivocal language of a policy; and therefore in an action on a policy of insurance "on the ship till moored at anchor twenty-four hours, and on the goods till discharged and safely landed," evidence having been ad-
*mitted, that by the custom of the trade the risk on the goods, * 436
as well as on the ship, expired in twenty-four hours, the court of King's Bench granted a new trial on that ground, and on the new trial the evidence was rejected (1) (*a*).

This doctrine of admitting evidence of usage to explain and construe mercantile contracts is strongly illustrated by the case of Cutter v. Powell (2), which was an action of assumpsit brought by an administratrix for work and labour done by the deceased. It appeared that the captain of a ship had given a note to the deceased, by which he promised to pay a sum of money to the deceased, provided

(3) Per Lord Ellenborough, C. J. in delivering judgment in Robertson v. French, 4 East 135.

(1) Parkinson v. Collier, sitt. after Mich. 1797, Park. Insur. 416.

(2) 6 T. R. 320.

(*a*) Where the legal effect of an instrument or of the terms used in it has been settled, no evidence of commercial usage is admissible. *Edie* v. *East India Company*, 2 *Burr.* 1216. *Frith* v. *Barker*, 2 *Johns. Rep.* 327. *Homer* v. *Dorr*, 10 *Mass. Rep.* 26. *Winthrop* v. *Union Ins. Co.* and *Ruan* v. *Gardner*, C. C. U S. P. 2 *Condy's Marsh.* 707. n.

that he proceeded on a voyage, and continued to do his duty as second mate, to the port of destination. The second mate died on the voyage, and the question was, whether the plaintiff could recover in this general action any portion of the wages for the time the deceased had served. An inquiry had been made by the direction of the court relative to the usage of merchants on this kind of agreement; but no settled usage could be ascertained one way or the other. Lord Kenyon in delivering his opinion, after stating that the deceased stipulated to receive the larger sum if the whole duty were performed, and unless the whole were performed, to receive nothing, added, that on this particular contract his opinion was at present formed; at the same time, said Lord Kenyon, if we were assured that these notes are in universal use, and that the commercial world have received and acted upon them in a different sense, I should give up my opinion. And Mr. Justice Lawrence said, "with regard to the common case of an hired servant, to which this has been compared, such a servant, though hired in a general way, is considered to be hired with reference to the general understanding upon the subject, that the servant shall be entitled to his wages for the time he serves, though he does not continue in the service during the whole year. So if the plaintiff in this case
* 437 *could have proved any usage, that persons in the situation of this mate are entitled to wages in proportion to the time they served, the plaintiff might have recovered according to that usage. But if this is to depend altogether on the terms of the contract itself, the plaintiff cannot recover any thing."

Agreements within the statute of frauds.

4. The same rule applies to all written agreements, which the statute of frauds requires to be in writing. They cannot be contradicted, or added to, or substantially varied by parol evidence (1); for such evidence would defeat the statute, and introduce that uncertainty, which it was the

(1) Binsted v. Coleman, Bunb. 65. Meres v. Ansell, 3 Wils. 275. Wain Parteriche v. Powlet, 2 Atk. 383. v. Warlters, 5 East 10.

object of the legislature as far as possible to suppress (*a*). Where the rent for a house was specified in a written agreement to be twenty-six pounds a year, and the landlord in an action for use and occupation proposed to show by parol evidence, that the tenant had also agreed to pay the ground-rent, the court refused to admit the evidence (2).† So, where a tenant, having paid the land-tax, brought an action to recover it back from his landlord, and gave in evidence a written memorandum of agreement in the plaintiff's hand-writing, which specified the rent and terms, but was silent respecting the payment of taxes, the defendant offered parol evidence, that previously to the drawing up *of the memorandum, it had been mentioned and was understood by the parties, that the rent was to be paid, clear of all taxes; this evidence was rejected, and the court of Common Pleas afterwards, on a motion for a rule to show cause why the verdict should not be set aside, adjudged the evidence to be inadmissible, and refused the rule (1) (*b*). *438

(2) Preston v. Merceau, 2 Black. 1249.

(1) Rich v. Jackson, 4 Bro. Ch. C. 515. 6 Ves. jun. 334. n. S. C.

† In the case of Preston v. Merceau, above cited, Mr. Justice Blackstone, after stating, that the court could neither alter the rent nor the term, the two things expressed in the agreement, is reported to have added, "that with respect to collateral matters it might be different; the plaintiff might show who was to put the house in repair, or the like, concerning which nothing is said." But this opinion is not consistent with the principle established in Meres v. Ansell, (3 Wils. 275.), Rich v. Jackson, (4 Bro. Ch. C. 515.), Powell v. Edmunds, (12 East 6.), and several other cases above mentioned, which plainly show, that parol evidence is not admissible either to vary or add to the terms of the written agreement. To add a new term, or to define what was before indefinite, is in effect to make a material variation.

(*a*) Vide *Clarke* v. *Russel*, 3 *Dall.* 424.

(*b*) So, where an agreement was made between A. and B. that A. should assign property to B., and B. should support A., and A. executed an assignment to B., specifying the consideration, it was held that no additional consideration could be proved. *Schermerhorn* v.

Upon the same principle, the verbal declarations of an auctioneer at the time of sale are not admissible in evidence for the purpose of varying, or adding to, or explaining the printed conditions of sale (2). Thus, where the conditions described only the number and kind of timber trees to be sold by lot, but said nothing as to the weight of the timber, the defendant, in an action for not completing his purchase according to the conditions, was not allowed to prove, that the auctioneer at the sale had warranted the quantity of timber to amount to a certain weight, and the court of King's Bench was of opinion, that this evidence had been properly rejected (3). Lord Ellenborough said, that "the purchaser ought to have had it reduced into writing at the time, if the representation then made as to the quantity swayed him to bid for the lot. If the parol evidence were admissible in this case, in what instance might not a party by parol testimony superadd any term to a written agreement? which would be setting aside all written contracts, and rendering them of no effect. There is no doubt, that the warranty as to the quantity of timber would vary the agreement contained in the written conditions of sale."

So, when a contract is made for the sale of goods, and the bargain has been reduced into writing, pursuant to the 17th section of the statute of frauds, parol evidence would not be admitted to show that the parties agreed to vary the quantity of goods to be delivered. But the rule is dif-
* 439 *ferent with respect to the time of delivery, or the particular mode of delivery, which are not essential parts of the

(2) Gunnis v. Erhart, 1 H. Bl. 289. Jenkinson v. Pepys, cited 6 Ves. jun. 330. Higginson v. Clowes, 15 Ves. jun. 516. Clowes v. Higginson, 1 Ves. & Beam. 524.

(3) Powell v. Edmunds, 12 East 6.

Vanderheyden, 1 *Johns. Rep.* 139. Where a letter of credit was addressed by mistake to *John & Joseph*, instead of *John & Jeremiah*, it was held that parol proof could not be admitted to show the mistake, so as to enable John and Jeremiah to maintain an action for goods delivered by them, on the faith of the letter of credit. *Grant* v. *Naylor*, 4 *Cranch* 224.

contract, but are frequently expressed in the memorandum, together with the quantity and the price of the goods, in order the more easily to carry the contract into execution; proof of a verbal agreement has therefore been allowed to prolong the time limited in a written contract for the delivery of a certain quantity of barley (1), on the ground that it was only a continuance of the original contract, a forbearance on the part of the plaintiff for a longer time (*a*). And in a very late case (2), where the question was, whether, after a part-delivery of goods, which by a written contract were to be delivered at fixed times, a verbal agreement to extend the time for the delivery of the remainder was good, the Court of King's Bench held that it was good; for this was not a parol variation of the contract, but what had been done was only in performance of the original contract; the parties agreed to a substitution of other days instead of those originally specified for its performance, but still the contract remained.

It has before been observed, that where no consideration is expressed in a deed, a consideration may be proved. But in some particular cases within the statute of frauds, the consideration must be stated in the written memorandum, and if it is not stated, the defect cannot be supplied by parol evidence; thus, in the case of Wain v. Warlters (3), which was an action on a promise to pay the debt of a third person, the Court of King's Bench held, that the memorandum signed by the defendant ought to have expressed the consideration of the promise as well as the promise itself, and, the consideration being omitted,

(1) Warren v. Stagg, ruled by Buller, J. cited in 3 T. R. 591.

(2) Cuff v. Penn, 1 Maule & Sel. 21.

(3) 5 East 10. As to this case, see Stadt v. Lill, 9 East 348. Ex parte Minet, 14 Ves. jun. 190. Ex parte Gardom, 15 Ves. 287. Bateman v. Phillips, 15 East 272.

(*a*) Vide *Keating* v. *Price*, 1 *Johns. Cas.* 22. in which parol evidence was admitted to extend the time of performance of a written contract for the delivery of goods.

that the plaintiff was not entitled to recover; for the 4th section of the statute of frauds enacts, among other things,
* 440 *that no action shall be brought, whereby to charge the defendant upon any special promise to answer for the debt, default, or miscarriage of another person, unless *the agreement*, upon which such action is brought, or some memorandum or note thereof, shall be in writing, and signed by the party to be charged*, &c.; and the Court of King's Bench held, in the construction of this clause, that the word "agreement" must be understood in its proper and correct sense; and that, as the consideration for the promise is part of the agreement, this ought also to be stated in writing. The same reasoning applies to all other cases within the fourth section, as where an action is brought on an agreement in consideration of marriage, or on any contract for an interest in land, or upon any agreement not to be performed within a year (*a*). It will not follow from the

* St. 29 C. 2. c. 3. s. 4. enacts, "that no action shall be brought, whereby to charge any executor or administrator upon any special promise to answer damages out of his own estate—or whereby to charge the defendant upon any special promise to answer for the debt, default, or miscarriages of another person—or to charge any person upon any agreement made upon consideration of marriage—or upon any contract or sale of lands, tenements, or hereditaments, or any interest in or concerning them—or upon any agreement, that is not to be performed within the space of one year from the making thereof—unless the agreement, upon which such action shall be brought, or some memorandum or note thereof, shall be in writing, and signed by the party to be charged therewith, or some other person thereunto by him lawfully authorized."

(*a*) Vide *Sears* v. *Brink*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 210. which was an action on a contract for the sale of lands, and in which the rule in Wain v. Warliters was adopted. The principle in that case, however, does not apply where the guaranty is simultaneous with the original undertaking, and they form but one transaction: in such case it is unnecessary to state the consideration, which may be proved by parol, and the consideration passing between the creditor and the principal debtor, is alone sufficient to support the promise of the guaranty. Thus, where A. applied to B. for goods

case of Wain v. Warlters, that the plaintiff cannot recover, unless the agreement is signed by *all the parties* to be bound; for though an agreement in its legal signification means "a mutual assent to do a thing, which ought to be so certain and complete, that each may have an action upon it (1)," yet the clause of the statute by stating expressly, "that no action shall be brought (whereby to charge, &c.), unless the agreement shall be in writing, and *signed by the party to be charged therewith*," implies that the other party may recover upon it without (*b*) having signed *it (1). Nor are the words of the statute to be construed so * 441
strictly, as to make it necessary to state precisely, in the memorandum of the agreement for paying the debt of another person, what is the exact amount of the debt; but it will be sufficient to engage to pay generally, for all the goods furnished within a certain time, or whatever sum the person may owe, &c., and the amount of the goods furnished, or of the debt contracted, is to be ascertained by evidence at the trial (2). In a late case of this kind (3), where the promise to pay was made by the defendant in a letter addressed by him to one G., (in which he undertook, in case G. would give the bearer D. W. indulgence for a certain time, to see him paid,) the Court of King's Bench were of opinion, that the evidence of G. had been properly

(1) Com. Dig. tit. Agreement.

(1) See 6 East 308. and the cases on this subject collected in Mr. Sugden's Tr. on the law of Vendor and Purchaser, 4th edit. p. 64.

(2) 15 East 274.

(3) Bateman v. Phillips, 15 East 272.

---

on credit, and B. refused to let him have them without security, on which A. drew a promissory note for the amount, under which C. wrote, *I guaranty the above*, and the goods were thereupon delivered, this was held sufficient to support an action against C. *Leonard* v. *Vredenburgh*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 29. *Bailey & Bogert* v. *Freeman*, 11 *Johns. Rep.* 221.

(*b*) Vide *Ballard* v. *Walker*, 3 *Johns. Cas* 60. *Roget* v. *Merritt & Clapp*, 2 *Caines' Rep.* 117.

admitted to prove, what was the amount of the debt, and also that he had been applied to by the defendant, as the attorney of the plaintiff, who employed him to sue D. W. for the debt owing to the plaintiff. The 17th section of the statute relating to contracts for the sale of goods, as well as the fourth, makes a written memorandum necessary in certain cases,* but it requires only a note or memorandum in writing of the *bargain*, not a memorandum of the *agreement ;* and under this section, it has been determined that the written memorandum need not express the consideration for the sale (4).

Contracts not within the statute of frauds. * 442

5. By the rule of law, independently of the statute of frauds, parol evidence cannot be received to contradict a *written agreement (*a*) ; the written instrument must be considered as containing the true agreement between the parties, and as furnishing better evidence than any which can be supplied by parol (1). The reason, assigned by Lord Coke, against admitting parol evidence to contradict the terms of a deed, is very general, and applies to the case of a written agreement, though no writing may have been absolutely necessary. " It would be inconvenient," he says, " that matters in writing, made on consideration, and which finally import the certain truth of the agreement of the parties, should be controlled by an averment of the

(4) Egerton v. Matthews, 6 East 307.

(1) 2 Atk. 383. 2 Bro. Ch. C. 219. 7 Ves. jun. 213. 4 Taunt. 786.

* St. 29 C. 2. c. 3. s. 17. enacts, " that no contract for the sale of any goods, wares, and merchandizes, for the price of ten pounds sterling or upwards, shall be allowed to be good, except the buyer shall accept part of the goods so sold, and actually receive the same, or give something in earnest to bind the bargain, or in part of payment, or that some note or memorandum in writing of the said bargain be made and signed by the parties to be charged by such contract, or their agents thereunto lawfully authorized."

(*a*) Vide *Fitzhugh* v. *Runyon*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 375. *Wallace* v. *Baker*, 1 *Binney* 610. *Dunham* v. *Baker*, 2 *Day* 137. *Carter* v. *Bellamy*, *Kirby* 291.

parties, to be proved by the uncertain testimony of slippery memory (2)." Thus, where there has been a contract in writing for the sale of goods, specifying the quantity and the price, neither of the contracting parties would be allowed to give evidence of conversations previous to or at the time of making the bargain, for the purpose of proving that the price was to be different, or that a different quantity was to be delivered; for this evidence would directly contradict the written memorandum, which must be considered as expressing the final intention and understanding of the parties at the time of the contract. For the same reason, if the time of carrying away the goods is not expressed in the agreement, (and therefore a reasonable time is allowed,) evidence will not be admitted, that the purchaser verbally agreed to carry them away immediately after the purchase (3). But if it was not necessary in the first instance to have the bargain reduced into writing, evidence of conversations *subsequent* to the time of making the agreement would probably be admitted, to show that the parties agreed afterwards to vary the contract, or add some new stipulation. Here the written agreement, so far as it purports to express the true meaning of the parties, that is, down to the time of its being concluded, is not in any manner contradicted or impugned; but from *the proposed evidence it would appear, that they afterwards varied or added to the contract; which is not inconsistent with any thing contained in the original agreement. Lord Hardwicke is reported to have said in a case before him (1), that "to add any thing to an agreement in writing by admitting parol evidence, which would affect land, is not only contrary to the statute of frauds, but to the rule of common law, before that statute was in being." It is not, however, expressly stated in the report of the case before Lord Hardwicke, whether the circumstance

*443

(2) 5 Rep. 26.

(3) Greaves v. Ashlin, 3 Campb. 426.

(1) Parteriche v. Powlet, 2 Atk. 384. See Clinan v. Cooke, 1 Schoal. & Lef. 35.

to which the parol evidence related, was previous or subsequent to the signing of the agreement; but it seems rather probable, from the nature of the case, that it was previous (*a*).

And though an ambiguity apparent on the face of a written instrument cannot be explained by extrinsic evidence, yet, where a question arises as to the general intention of the parties, concerning which the instrument is not decisive, it has been held, that proof of independent facts collateral to the instrument may be properly admitted. Thus, in the case of King v. Laindon (2), where, on a question between two parishes respecting the settlement of a pauper, it appeared, that the pauper agreed to serve a person three years to learn the business of a carpenter, and evidence was admitted at the sessions, that, at the time of making this agreement, the pauper agreed also to give a sum of money as a premium to be taught the trade; that he paid the money, and that he was not to be employed, nor was he employed, in any other work than that of a carpenter; the court of King's Bench held, that the evidence was properly admitted, as it was not offered to contradict the written agreement, but to ascertain an independent fact collateral to the written instrument, in order to explain the intention of the parties, the
* 444 *instrument being in some measure equivocal. It does not distinctly appear from the report, whether the fact alluded to was the verbal agreement, (by which the pauper agreed to pay a premium, and stipulated that he was to do only

(2) 8 T. R. 379. And see 14 Ves. 170.

(*a*) That parol evidence is admissible to contradict or explain a bill of lading, or receipt, vide ante, 74. n. & *Maryland Ins. Co.* v. *Ruden's Admr.* 6 *Cranch* 338. A bill of parcels delivered by I. stating the goods as bought of D. and I. is not conclusive evidence against I. that the goods were the joint property of D. and I. but the real circumstances may be explained by parol. *Harris* v. *Johnston*, 3 *Cranch.* 311.

carpenter's work,) or only the payment of a certain sum of money by the pauper to the master at the time when the agreement was made. But from the opinions expressed by the Court, in which the evidence of the verbal agreement was not adverted to, it may be inferred, that the latter fact alone was adjudged to be admissible. Lord Kenyon said, "The evidence was offered to ascertain an independent fact, and I think it was properly received in evidence. That being so, the case appears to be shortly this: *in consideration of three guineas paid by the pauper, the master undertook to teach him the business of a carpenter, and the pauper was to serve three years.*" Mr. Justice Lawrence expressed himself nearly in the same words; and Mr. Justice Le Blanc concurred in opinion with the Court, that the parol evidence was admissible, as evidence of a fact collateral to the written instrument (1).

Parol agreements discharged by parol.

A deed cannot be discharged or revoked by parol; for every contract or agreement, says Lord Coke, ought to be dissolved by matter of as high a nature as the first deed (*a*);

(1) See also 14 East 544.

(*a*) Vide *Kelleran* v. *Brown*, 4 *Mass. Rep.* 443. The time of the performance of the condition of a bond may be enlarged by a parol agreement of the parties; and where certain acts were done by the obligor, amounting to a substantial, though not to a literal performance of the condition, it was held, that evidence of a parol agreement, by the obligee, to waive any further performance, was admissible. *Fleming* v. *Gilbert*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 528. *Keating* v. *Price*, 1 *Johns. Cas.* 22. But in all these cases in which parol proof has been admitted of an agreement to enlarge the time, or dispense with the performance, the agreement was subsequent to the time of the original contract, and admitted the force and effect of it; but it would be inadmissible to show the original agreement to be different from what appears on the face of the instrument; as that it was intended at the time of the making of a promissory note that it should not be payable until a period subsequent to that on which it was expressed to become due. *Thompson* v. *Ketcham*, 8 *Johns. Rep.* 189.

nihil tam conveniens est naturali æquitati, quam unumquodque dissolvi eo ligamine, quo ligatum est (2). But it appears to be generally understood, that executory agreements in writing, not under seal, may before breach be discharged and abandoned by a subsequent unwritten agreement, as well in cases where the original contract is required by the statute of frauds to be in writing, as where writing is unnecessary. The reason above, cited from Lord Coke's reports, applies only to agreements by specialty. Agreements, not by specialty, whether written or unwritten, are classed on the same level, and denominated
*445 *agreements by parol; there is no such third class recognized by the law of England as contracts in writing not under seal; if they are merely written and not specialties, they are called parol (*a*) (or, more properly, simple) contracts (1). It follows, therefore, that to admit evidence of an unwritten agreement, for the purpose of showing an abandonment or discharge of a previous written agreement, would not be to dissolve the agreement by matter of an inferior nature (*b*.) Nor does the statute of frauds contain any provision respecting the dissolution of agreements; it prescribes the manner of revoking wills, and in many cases makes a written memorandum necessary in order to establish and enforce agreements, but as to the discharge or abandonment of executory agreements the statute is entirely silent, leaving the case as it stood at common law. The 17th section enacts, in certain cases, that "*a contract for the sale of goods* shall not be allowed to be good, unless some note or memorandum, in writing, of the bargain shall be made and signed," &c.; but an agreement to

(2) 5 Rep. 26. a. 3 Lev. 234. Blake's case, 6 Co. Rep. 44. a. Braddick v. Thompson, 8 East 344.

(1) Rann v. Hughes, 7 T. R. 350. n.

(*a*) Acc. *Ballard* v. *Walker*, 3 *Johns. Cas.* 60.

(*b*) So, the holder of a bill of exchange may discharge the acceptor by parol. *Whatley & others* v. *Tricker and others*, 1 *Campb.* 35.

waive the contract, before breach, is not a contract for the sale of goods, and may therefore be binding, though not reduced into writing. So, the fourth section enacts, that "no action shall be brought *upon any contract or sale of lands*, &c., or any interest in or concerning them, unless the agreement, upon which the action shall be brought, or some memorandum or note thereof shall be in writing," &c.; this is very different from enacting, that all contracts or agreements *concerning* land shall be in writing, terms so general and comprehensive that, if they had been introduced into the act, they might be considered as including an agreement for the waiver of a purchase contract, as well as the original agreement itself; the section only provides, that "*no action shall be brought upon any contract or sale of lands*," &c., but it does not proceed to enact, in case an action is brought, and the defence set up is a dissolution and abandonment of the agree-
*ment, that some note or written memorandum is also *446
necessary to give effect and validity to such subsequent agreement.

On a bill filed in a court of equity for the specific performance of a written agreement, it appears to be the better opinion, that the defendant may insist, that the agreement has been since discharged merely by parol between the parties (1). In the case of Buckhouse and Crossby (2), indeed, where a bill was filed for the specific performance of a contract for the sale of an estate, and the defendant insisted that the contract had been discharged by parol, in support of which the case of Goman v. Salisbury was cited as an authority, Lord Hardwicke is reported to have declared, that, "though he would not say, that a contract in writing could not be waived by parol, yet he should expect in such a case a very clear proof, and the proof in the

(1) Goman v. Salisbury, 1 Vern. 240., cited and approved by Sir J. Strange in Legal v. Miller, 2 Ves. 299., and in Pitcairne v. Ogbourne, 2 Ves. 376., and cited by Lord Chancellor Redesdale in 1 Schoal. & Lef. 39. 2 Ves. 299. S. P. 1 Ves. jun. 404. S. P. 17 Ves. jun. 356. S. P.

(2) Eq. Cas. Ab. 32.

case before him he thought very insufficient to discharge a contract in writing;" Lord Hardwicke then observed, that the statute of frauds requires, "that all contracts and agreements concerning land should be in writing, and that an agreement to waive a purchase-contract is as much an agreement concerning land as the original contract; however, there was not occasion then to determine the point*."

*447 *And in the case of Bell v. Howard (1), Lord Hardwicke, after noticing an objection on the part of the defendant against decreeing an execution of written articles for the sale of an advowson, (namely, that the plaintiff had waived the articles,) is reported to have said, that "it was certain an interest in land could not be parted with or waived by naked parol without writing;" but added, "that articles may by parol be so far waived, that if the party come into a court of equity, to have a specific execution of them, such parol-waiver will rebut the equity which the party before had, and prevent the court from executing them specifically." But in the last case on this subject (2), where the plaintiff prayed a specific performance of an agreement for a lease, under which the plaintiff had taken possession, and

(1) 9 Mod. 302.

(2) Price v. Dyer, 17 Ves. 356. 363. See also 9 Ves. 250.

*In this case of Buckhouse and Crossby, the waiver was not between the purchaser and vendor, but between a former and a subsequent purchaser. The material facts of the case will be found to be, that A. seised of lands in fee simple mortgaged them to the defendant, and afterwards authorized his attorney to sell the estate, who sold it by parol agreement to the plaintiff; A. being informed of this, wrote to the plaintiff, acquainting him, that he accepted the purchase-money; afterwards A. by letter offered the estate for the same money to a third person, who agreed with A. for the purchase on behalf of the defendant, and accordingly A. by indenture conveyed the premises to the defendant, in consideration of 300 guineas then paid. Before this conveyance, C., who treated for the purchase on behalf of the defendants, had notice of the plaintiff's title, but being examined as witness for the defendant, swore that, before the conveyance was executed to him, the plaintiff agreed, that all prior contracts between him and A. should be void, and that it should be referred to A., whether the plaintiff or the defendant should be the purchaser, and that A., being written to, gave the preference to the defendant.

afterwards, as the defendant stated in his answer, the parties mutually abandoned the terms of the written agreement, and made another agreement by parol, the Master of the Rolls, observing upon the argument for the defendant, "that the agreement was waived, and that a written agreement may be so far waived by parol, that the court will refuse the interposition of its equitable jurisdiction to enforce it," said, that as he conceived there was not in the case before him any waiver within the meaning of the dicta or the decisions upon the subject, it was not necessary for him to give any precise opinion upon the point; "but," he added, "as at present advised, I incline to think upon the doctrine of this court, such would be the effect of a parol waiver clearly and satisfactorily proved. The waiver spoken of in the cases is an entire abandonment and dissolution of the contract, restoring the parties to their former *situation. No such thing was for a moment in the contemplation of the parties. All that they at any time meant was to add to or modify the terms of the original agreement." The bill was accordingly dismissed, but without costs. * 448

Sect. III.

Of the Rule in Courts of Equity, respecting the Admissibility of Parol Evidence.

The rules of evidence in courts of equity are the same as in courts of common law; and it is a general principle, established in the former, no less than in the latter, that parol evidence of the intention of the parties is not admissible to vary or add to the terms of a written agreement (1). If the agreement is certain, explained in writing, and signed by the parties, that binds them; if it is not cer-

(1) Fell v. Chamberlaine, 2 Dick. 424. Hare v. Shearwood, 1 Ves. jun. 241. Jordan v. Sawkins, 3 Br. Ch. C. 388. 1 Ves. jun. 402. S. C. Jackson v. Cator, 5 Ves. jun. 688.

tain, and parol evidence is necessary to prove what the terms were, to admit such evidence would effectually break in upon the statute of frauds, and introduce all the mischief, inconvenience, and uncertainty, which the statute was designed to prevent (2). In the case of Rich v. Jackson (3), therefore, on a bill for specific performance, the court of Chancery gave the same judgment against the admissibility of parol evidence varying a written contract, as had been previously given by the court of Common Pleas in an action between the same parties. "The question," said Lord Rosslyn in that case, "is, whether in equity any more than at law such evidence ought to be admitted; whether there is any distinction in a court of equity, where a party comes to enforce a written agreement by obtaining a more formal instrument, and to add, in doing that, a term not expressed in the written agreement, and of such a nature as to bear against the written agreement? * 449 *I have looked into all the cases, and cannot find that this court has ever taken upon itself, in executing a written agreement by a specific performance, to add to it by any circumstance that parol evidence could introduce."

There are certain exceptions to this general rule, the principal of which will be briefly considered in the following section. First, it will be inquired, in what cases a *defendant* may prove by parol evidence a variation in a written agreement, contrary to the intention of the party; secondly, whether a *plaintiff* may produce such evidence. Some cases will then be mentioned, in which extrinsic evidence has been admitted, to rectify mistakes in deeds, and for the purpose of raising trusts in wills.

1. When a court of equity is called upon to exercise its peculiar jurisdiction by decreeing a specific performance, the party *to be charged* is admitted to show, that under the circumstances the plaintiff is not entitled to have the agreement specifically performed (1). The admission of such evidence as matter of defence is very frequent; it is used

(2) Per Buller, J., Brodie v. St. Paul, 1 Ves. jun. 333.

(3) Vid. sup. 438.

(1) 7 Ves. jun. 219.

to rebut an equity. The defendant says, "the agreement which you seek, is not the agreement which I meant to enter into;" and then he is let in to prove fraud or mistake (2). For the court will not grant a decree for specific performance, unless it is satisfied, that under all the circumstances it is equitable to give more relief, than the plaintiff is entitled to at law.

The statute of frauds has not altered the situation of a defendant, against whom a specific performance is prayed; and he may give the same evidence now, which he might have given before (3). For the words of the statute are, that "no person shall be charged upon any contract or sale of lands, &c., unless the agreement or some memoran- *dum or note thereof shall be in writing, and signed by the party to be charged therewith or some other person thereunto by him lawfully authorized." No person, then, can be charged with the execution of an agreement, who has not either by himself or his agent signed a written agreement; but the statute does not say, that, if a written agreement is signed, the same exception to it may not be taken as before the statute. Now before the statute, if a bill had been brought for specific performance, and it had appeared that the agreement had been prepared contrary to the intent of the defendant, he might have said, "that is not the agreement meant to have been signed." Such a case is left as it was by the statute; the statute does not say that a written agreement shall bind, but that an unwritten agreement shall not bind (1). * 450

The general principle, to be deduced from the various authorities on this subject (2), appears to be, that a defendant in answer to a bill for a specific performance may suggest and prove by parol evidence, that by reason of

(2) 1 Schoal. & Lef. 39.
(3) 14 Ves. jun. 524.
(1) See Lord Redesdale's judgment in the case of Clinan v. Cooke, 1 Schoal. & Lef. 39.
(2) Joynes v. Statham, 3 Atk. 388. Marquis of Townsend v. Stangroom, 6 Ves. jun. 328. Woollam v. Hearn, 7 Ves. jun. 211. Clarke v. Grant, 14 Ves. jun. 524. Ramsbottom v. Gosden, 1 Ves. & Beam. 165. Winch v. Winchester, 1 Ves. & Beam. 375.

fraud, surprise, or mistake, the written instrument does not correctly and truly express the agreement, but that there is an omission or insertion of a term, or some material variation, contrary to the intention and understanding of the parties.

The defendant may be admitted also to prove by parol evidence, that, after signing the written agreement, the parties made a verbal agreement varying the former; provided those variations have been so acted upon, that the original agreement can no longer be enforced without a fraud upon the defendant. This, in a case where
*451 there was a written agreement for the lease of a *house, at the annual rent of 32*l.*, and that the owner of the house should put it in repair; it was afterwards discovered, that the house was not worth repairing, and without any alteration of the agreement the house was in consequence pulled down with the consent of the tenant, who was apprised of the great expense, which the landlord must necessarily have incurred in making the repairs; the tenant then made a verbal agreement to add 8*l.* per annum to the 32*l.*, provided the house should be rebuilt; and on a bill brought by the tenant for a specific performance of the lease, on the foot of the written agreement to pay 32*l.* rent, the defendant in his answer set up the parol agreement (1). Here the original agreement was unexceptionable, but the execution of it under the new circumstances would have been a fraud upon the landlord; the landlord having rebuilt instead of repairing the house, and the tenant having agreed to pay an additional rent in consideration of the additional expense. But variations, verbally agreed upon, are not sufficient to prevent the execution of a written agreement, where the situation of the parties in all other respects remains unaltered (2).

2. Whether a *plaintiff* in equity, on a bill for the specific performance of a written agreement, can in any case

(1) Legal v. Miller, 2 Ves. 299., cited 6 Ves. jun. 336. n.; and 17 Ves. jun. 364.

(2) 17 Ves. jun. 364., and see Omerod v. Hardman, 5 Ves. jun. 722.

be admitted to prove, that some terms of the agreement have been omitted or varied by fraud, mistake, or surprise, and that the agreement is different from what the parties intended; and whether, on such a case being distinctly proved, the plaintiff can obtain a decree for a specific performance of the agreement in its rectified form, is a much larger and more difficult question, and one on which it is not easy to reconcile all the authorities. In the cases of Lord Irnham v. Child (3), and Lord Portmore v. Morris (4), *where the plaintiff filed a bill to redeem an annuity, and the question was, whether parol evidence could be admitted to show, that the parties intended the annuity to be redeemable, but did not insert in the deed a clause to that effect, supposing it would make the transaction usurious†; Lord Thurlow in the one case, and Lord Kenyon in the other, thought it clear, that if the clause had been omitted by *fraud*, or if the agreement had been varied by fraud, the evidence would be admissible. Lord Thurlow, in the former case, after saying, that the rule of evidence is not subverted, if there is clear proof of *fraud*, added, "then as to *mistake* or *accident*, suppose it were a clear thing, that one agreement was intended, and that by accident it was extended further; but there is no such case in the books; if *admitted* to be a mistake, the court would not overturn the rule of equity by varying the deed, but it would be an equity dehors the deed. Then it should be

*452

(3) 1 Bro. Ch. C. 91. (4) 2 Bro. Ch. C. 219.

† Lord Eldon has observed (*a*) on these cases, that they proceed on an indisputably clear principle, that the parties did not mean to insert in the agreement a provision for redemption, because they agreed that it would be usurious; and they desired the court to do not what they intended, for the insertion of that provision was directly contrary to that intention; but they desired to be put in the same situation as if they had been better informed, and consequently had a contrary intention. The answer is, they admit it was not to be in the deed; and why was the court to insert it, where two risks had occurred to the parties? the danger of usury, and the danger of trusting to the honour of the party.

(*a*) 6 Ves. jun. 332.

proved as much to the satisfaction of the court, as if it were admitted." In another part of his judgment Lord Thurlow says, "It is necessary to see the statement of the bill; if it states, that it was agreed, that the clause for redemption should not be inserted, they cannot read the evidence; but if it is stated, that it was intended to insert the clause, but that it was suppressed by *fraud*, I cannot refuse to hear evidence read to establish the rule of equity. They are at liberty to read evidence to prove such *fraud* as will make a ground in equity."

*453 *This doctrine respecting the propriety of receiving parol evidence on the part of the *plaintiff* under circumstances of clear *fraud*, appears to have been admitted in other modern cases (1). The difficulty has generally been in carrying the principle into practice, and in ascertaining what constitutes a fraud. In the case of Pember v. Mathers (2), Lord Thurlow allowed the plaintiff, on a bill for specific performance, to give parol evidence of a promise by the defendant under the following circumstances. The bill was filed by the original lessees of a leasehold estate, against an assignee of the lease, on his parol undertaking to indemnify the plaintiff against all rents and covenants to be paid or kept on the part of the lessee, and to execute a bond for such an indemnity. The assignment had been made by a sale by auction; and the conditions of sale did not stipulate the indemnity; but it rested only on parol evidence. This evidence was objected to as inadmissible, on the ground, that, where the parties have entered into a written agreement, no parol evidence could be admitted to increase or diminish such agreement. Lord Thurlow said, "the rule is right; but where the objection (to the omission of an article) was formally made, and promised by the other party to be rectified, it comes among the string of cases, where it is considered as a fraud upon the rule of law." As some

(1) See Marquis of Townsend v. Stangroom, 6 Ves. jun. 338.

(2) 1 Bro. Ch. C. 51.

doubt arose, whether the evidence was sufficient to establish the parol undertaking to indemnify, entered into by the defendants, Lord Thurlow directed an issue to be tried, whether such promise was made on the day of the execution of the assignment; and, this being found in the affirmative, the plaintiff had a decree for a specific performance. In speaking, however, of the case of Pember v. Mathers, the present Master of the Rolls appears to have entertained some doubt, how far it would be proper to go the whole length of the doctrine there laid down, or *to decree a specific performance, on the ground of such a promise (1). * 454

It does not appear from any reported case, that the *plaintiff* has been allowed to give parol evidence, varying a written agreement, on the ground of *mistake* or *surprise*. In the case of Joynes v. Statham (2), indeed, where, on a bill for the specific performance of an agreement for the lease of a house at a certain rent, the *defendant* was admitted to prove by parol evidence, that the agreement was for rent, clear of all taxes, Lord Chancellor Hardwicke, after observing, that "the *defendant* had a right to insist, *either on account of an omission, mistake, or fraud*, that the plaintiff should not have a specific performance," is reported to have added, "Suppose the defendant had been the plaintiff, and had brought a bill for a specific performance of the agreement, I do not see but that he might have been allowed the benefit of disclosing this to the court; because it was an agreement executory only, and as in leases there are always covenants relating to taxes, the master will inquire, what the agreement was as to taxes; and therefore the proof offered here is not a variation of the agreement, but is explanatory only of what those taxes were." Lord Redesdale in a very late case (3), commenting on this passage, observed, "that the words do not appear to import any thing posi-

(1) See 14 Ves. jun. 524.
(2) 3 Atk. 388.
(3) Clinan v. Cooke, 1 Schoal. & Lef. 39. See also 4 Bro. Ch. C. 518. 6 Ves. jun. 335. n.; and 7 Ves. jun. 220.

tive;" and with respect to the case, which, Lord Hardwicke conceived, might possibly be made, where even a plaintiff might be admitted to show an omission in a written instrument as well on the ground of mistake as of fraud,† added, that he could find no decision, except the contrary way.

* 455 *In the case of the Marquis of Townshend v. Stangroom (1), Lord Eldon, after observing "that it was competent to a court of equity, (for the purpose of enabling it to determine whether it will specifically execute an agreement,) to receive evidence of the circumstances under which it was obtained," added, "and I will not say, that there are no cases in which it may be received to enable the court *to rectify a written agreement upon surprise or mistake, as well as fraud;* proper irrefragable evidence, as clearly satisfactory, that there has been mistake or surprise, as, in the other case, that there has been fraud. I agree that those producing evidence of mistake or surprise, either to rectify an agreement, or calling upon the court to refuse a specific performance, undertake a case of great difficulty; but it does not follow, that it is therefore incompetent to prove the actual existence of it by evidence." A specific performance was in this case sought, with a variation attempted to be introduced by parol. And Lord Eldon stated, "he would not say, that, upon the evidence without the answer, he should not have had so much doubt, whether he ought not to rectify the agreement, as to take more time to consider, whether the bill should be dismissed; but the evidence must be taken, due regard being had to the answer (2); and the Court is

(1) 6 Ves. jun. 338.

(2) And see 1 Bro. Ch. C. 92. 2 Bro. Ch. C. 168. 1 Ves. jun. 241.

† The words of Lord Redesdale, in the report, are as follows: "There seems to have been something of a floating idea in the mind of Lord Hardwicke, that by possibility a case might be made, in which even a plaintiff might be admitted to show an omission, *either by mistake or fraud.* However I can find no decision except the contrary way."

not to decide upon the allegation as to the probability, against the answer." The bill was accordingly dismissed, but without costs.

The later case of Woollam v. Hearn (3), determined by the Master of the Rolls on great consideration, sets the doctrine of the courts of equity on this subject in a very *distinct and clear point of view. The plaintiff there filed a bill for the specific performance of an agreement for a lease; and the bill stated, that the rent of 73l. 10s., specified in the agreement, was inserted by mistake, or with some unfair view; the real agreement being, that the plaintiff was to have the lease upon the same rent as the defendant paid to his lessor, and that he the defendant did not pay more than 60l. The defendant in his answer admitted, he might have said, that the plaintiff should have the lease upon the same terms, not meaning the same rent, but upon terms on the whole equally advantageous; insisting, that as he had laid out a great deal of money, the plaintiff would upon the whole have as good a bargain. The plaintiff offered parol evidence to prove, that he was to have it on the same terms as the defendant had it, and to show, that nothing could be meant by the expression, but the same rent; nothing being in discussion between them, but the amount of the rent. The question was, whether this evidence was admissible. The Master of the Rolls, in giving judgment, said, that "by the rule of law, independent of the statute of frauds, parol evidence could not be received to contradict a written agreement. To admit it for the purpose of proving, that the written instrument does not contain the real agreement, would be the same as receiving it for every purpose. It was for the purpose of shutting out that inquiry, that the rule of law was adopted. Though the written instrument does not contain the terms, it must in contemplation of law be taken to contain the agreement, as furnishing better evidence than any that parol can supply. If this had been

* 456

(3) 7 Ves. jun. 211.

a bill brought by the *defendant* for a specific performance," added the Master of the Rolls, "I should have been bound by the decisions to admit the parol evidence, and to refuse a specific performance. But this evidence is offered, not for the purpose of resisting, but of obtaining a decree; first, to falsify the written agreement, and then to substitute in its place a parol agreement to be executed by the court. Thinking as I do, that the statute has been
*457 *already too much broken in upon by supposed equitable exceptions, I shall not go farther in receiving and giving effect to parol evidence, than I am forced by precedent. There is no case, in which the court has gone the length now desired. But two cases (1) are produced, in which, it is said, there is an intimation from Lord Hardwicke to that effect. Upon this, it might be sufficient to say, it was not decided. But it is evident from the manner in which that great Judge qualifies his own doubts, that he thought it impossible to maintain such a proposition as the plaintiff is driven to maintain. In Walker v. Walker, it is to be observed, first, that the parol evidence was not offered for the purpose of contradicting any thing in the written agreement. It was admitted, that, as far as it went, it stated the true meaning; but it was contended by the defendant, that there was another collateral agreement, which the plaintiff ought to execute, before he could have the benefit of the written agreement; it was evidence too, offered in defence, to resist a decree. The evidence offered in this case," added the Master of the Rolls, concluding his judgment, "is to vary an agreement in a material part; and having varied it, to procure it to be executed in another form. There is nothing to show that this ought to be done." The proposed evidence was accordingly rejected; and the bill dismissed, without costs.

Where a written agreement has been varied by parol, and there has been such a part-performance of the parol

(1) Walker v. Walker, 2 Atk. 98. Joynes v. Statham, 3 Atk. 388.

variation, as would have procured it to be specifically executed, provided it had formed a part of the original agreement, the plaintiff in that case will be admitted to give evidence of such subsequent unwritten variation. As to what constitutes a part-performance, Lord Redesdale, in a very late case (2), has laid down the following rule, that *" nothing is to be considered as a part-performance, which *458
does not put the party into a situation, that is a fraud upon him, unless the agreement is performed; for instance, if upon a parol agreement, a man is admitted into possession, he is made a trespasser, and is liable to answer as a trespasser, if there be no agreement. This is put strongly in the case of Foxcraft v. Lister (1); there, the party was let into possession on a parol agreement, and it was said that he ought not to be liable as a wrong-doer, and to account for the rents and profits, because he entered in pursuance of an agreement. Then, for the purpose of defending himself against a charge, which might otherwise be made against him, such evidence was admissible; and if it was admissible for such purpose, there is no reason why it should not be admissible throughout. That," said Lord Redesdale, "I apprehend to be the ground on which courts of equity have proceeded, in permitting part-performance of an agreement to be a ground for avoiding the statute; and I take it, therefore, that nothing is to be considered as part-performance, which is not of that nature. Payment of money is not part-performance, for it may be repaid; and then the parties will be just as they were before, especially if repaid with interest. But the great reason, why part-payment does not take such an agreement out of the statute, is, that the statute has said, that in another case, namely, with respect to goods, it shall operate as a part-performance; and the courts have therefore considered this as excluding agreements for lands, because it is to be inferred, that when the legislature said it should bind in the case of goods, and were silent as to

(2) Clinan v. Cooke, 1 Schoal. & Lef. 41. 14 Ves. jun. 388.

(1) 2 Vern. 456.

the case of lands, they meant it should not bind in the case of lands."

3. Mistakes and misapprehensions in the drawers of deeds or written agreements are a subject for relief in courts of equity, (*a*) and may be rectified according to the
* 459 *true intention of the parties (1). Thus, on a bill to rectify a mistake in a policy of insurance, which the plaintiff suggested to have been made too general and contrary to the intention of the parties, Lord Hardwicke said (2), there could be no doubt, but that the court of Chancery had jurisdiction to relieve in respect of a plain mistake in contracts in writing, as well as against fraud in contracts; so that if reduced into writing, contrary to the intention of the parties, *on proper proof* that would be rectified (*b*). "This," as Lord Eldon has observed (3), "is loose in one sense, as it leaves to every judge to say, whether the proof is that proper proof, which ought to satisfy him." The principal evidence on the part of the plaintiff, in this case, was the deposition of a witness, who had transacted the business for the Company, (the defendants,) but this evidence appeared to the court not sufficiently certain to be relied upon. Lord Hardwicke observed, that the proof in such a case ought to be the strongest possible; and as it did not sufficiently appear to the court, that the policy had been framed contrary to the intention and real agreement of the parties, the bill was dismissed. In the case of Baker v. Paine, on a bill filed for an account under a written agreement, the minutes and calculations, which had been previously made by the parties, were admitted in evidence, in order to prove a mistake made in the agree-

(1) 2 Atk. 203.

(2) Henkle v. Roy. Ex. Assur. Comp. 1 Ves. 318., cited 6 Ves. jun. 333. See also Motteux v. Lond. Assur. Comp. 1 Atk. 545. Thomas v. Fraser, 3 Ves. jun. 399. 10 Ves. jun. 227.

(3) 6 Ves. jun. 333.

(*a*) Vide *Washburn* v. *Merrills*, 1 *Day* 139. *Cook* v. *Preston*, 2 *Root* 78. *Chapman* v. *Allen*, *Kirby* 399.

(*b*) Vide *Graves & Barnewall* v. *Boston Marine Ins. Co.* 2 *Cranch* 418.

ment by the person employed to draw it (4). And in a variety of cases where settlements have been drawn by mistake, contrary to the instructions of the parties, the mistake has been rectified by courts of equity, and the settlement made conformably to the instructions (5). The court however, will expect full and satisfactory evidence of the mistake and misapprehension of the party's intention, be- *fore it will alter a settlement. In one case, where the parol evidence of the attorney, who had received verbal instructions, was offered, the court held, that as nothing appeared in writing under the hands of the parties to show their intention, the settlement could not be altered (1); and in another case, Sir Thomas Clarke is reported to have said, that he did not give a positive opinion as to the head of mistake, but he did not think the court had relied on parol evidence only (2). * 460

4. Provisions in wills have in certain cases been enlarged by parol evidence, and trusts in equity raised, as against executors or other persons claiming an interest under wills, where it has appeared that the testator intended to make a further provision in his will, but omitted to insert it on receiving a promise, that, notwithstanding such omission, his intention should be carried into effect. Thus, in the case of Oldham v. Litchford (3), a witness was allowed to prove, that the defendant, who was the testator's executor and devisee of his real estate, had promised the testator, that he would pay the annuity bequeathed to the plaintiff, and that otherwise the testator would have charged the real estate with the payment. And on this evidence, it was decreed at the Rolls, that the real estate should be charged with the annuity: and this decree was afterwards affirmed on appeal to the court

(4) Baker v. Paine, 1 Ves. 457., cited in Rich v. Jackson, 6 Ves. jun. 336. n.

(5) Randal v. Randal, 2 P. Wms. 469. Jenkins v. Quinchant, 5 Ves. jun. 596. n. Barstow v. Kilvington, 5 Ves. jun. 593. Burt v. Barlow, 3 Bro. Ch. C. 451.

(1) Harwood v. Wallis, cited 2 Ves. 195.

(2) 1 Dick. 295. And see Shegold v. Boone, 13 Ves. jun. 373. 376.

(3) 2 Vern. 506.

of Chancery. In a later case (4), where a bill was filed against an executor and residuary legatee, to have a bequest enlarged, it appeared from a paper written by the defendant himself, that the testator, a few days before his death, had mentioned to him what he had bequeathed to the plaintiff, and that it was his wish that he should have a larger sum; it was further proved, that after the testator's death, when the paper was shown to the defendant, *he promised to perform the same according to the testator's request; another witness proved, that the testator mentioned to him, in the presence of the defendant, the annuity which he had bequeathed to the plaintiff, and that it was his desire he should have a larger annuity, mentioning the sum; that the testator then requested the defendant to see such annuity paid to the plaintiff, and the defendant promised it should be done, as if it had been expressed in the will; and lastly, that the witness and the defendant desired the testator to send for some person to draw a new will, which the testator refused to do, saying he would leave it to the defendant's generosity. "Upon this evidence," said the Master of the Rolls, "the question is, whether, by reposing that trust in the defendant, the testator was not prevented from making a new will. The defendant ought to have told him, that if he did not put it in his will, he would not do it. Instead of that, he promised to do it; upon which the testator refused to make a new will. I am quite relieved," added the Master of the Rolls, "from any difficulty as to the statute of frauds. The question is, whether the confidence, that the defendant would perform the trust he undertook, did not prevent the testator from making a new will." The court accordingly ordered the defendant to pay the increased sum out of the assets, with costs; and, if the assets were

*461

(4) Barrow v. Greenough, 3 Ves. jun. 152.

not sufficient for the costs, that he should pay them personally (*a*).

(*a*) Trusts arising or resulting by implication or construction of law, or transferred or extinguished by art or operation of law, are excepted in the statute of frauds; and hence if land be purchased by one person with the money of another who receives a deed in his own name, the trust in favour of the person advancing the consideration, may be proved by parol. 2 *Fonb. Treat. of Eq.* 119. *Amb.* 409. *Jackson* d. *Kane* v. *Sternbergh*, 1 *Johns. Cas.* 153. *Foote* v. *Colvin*, 3 *Johns. Rep.* 215. *Gregory's Lessee* v. *Setter*, 1 *Dall.* 193.

END OF THE SECOND PART.

INDEX.

A

ACCESS,
want of, cannot be proved by father or mother ; 180.
nor by their declarations after their deaths, Id.
may be proved by circumstantial evidence, 113.
ACCESSARY,
conviction of principal, how far evidence against, 229. 230.
ACCOMPLICE. See tit. *Principal.*
in felony, a competent witness ; 28. 29.
though promised a pardon or reward ; 31.
or separately indicted, 31.
or convicted, if not attainted, Id.
act of, evidence against the rest, when, 74.
principal felon, witness against accessary, 31.
in misdemeanors, competent ; 31.
in trespass, 31.
confirmatory evidence, how far necessary, 32.
dying declarations of, 201.
ACCORD AND SATISFACTION,
evidence under non assumpsit, 127.
ACQUITTAL,
in Court of Exchequer, on information, 258. See tit. *Exchequer.*
in criminal prosecution, not evidence to disprove the fact in civil suits, 242.
by foreign court of competent jurisdiction, 252.
ACTS OF PARLIAMENT,
general acts, 219.
distinction of public and private, when first adopted, 220.
taken notice of judicially, Id.
not given in evidence unless pleaded, when, Id.
statute of usury—in debt on bond ; Id.
otherwise, in assumpsit, 221.
statute exempting from penalty evidence under nil debet, Id.
proof of, 288.
private acts, 220.
not taken notice of judicially, unless pleaded ; 220.

ACTS OF PARLIAMENT, (*continued.*)
except where recognised by public act, or under special clause, Id.
proof of, by examined copy, 289.
ADDRESS,
public how proved, 305.
ADMINISTRATION,
how granted, 300.
letters of, proved by certificate, Id.
by original book of acts, Id.
examined copy, 301.
ADMIRALTY,
Sentence in court of, conclusive in questions of prize, 248. 249.
on all courts and persons, Id.
proof of, 296.
in foreign court of, conclusive evidence in this country, when; 249. 250.
though founded on particular ordinances, 250.
conclusive, upon what points, Id.
when condemnation is general, Id.
when not conclusive, when not admissible, 251.
ADMISSION. See tit. *Confesssion, Answer in Chancery.*
against interest; 191. 192.
entry by deceased steward, &c. charging himself, Id.
by agent. See tit. *Agent.*
by party to suit, evidence against him; 71. 72. &c.
on record, though merely trustees; Id.
interested, though not on record, Id.
of rated inhabitant, on question of settlement; Id.
of party, for whose benefit the action is brought, Id.
effect of, 78. 80.
of defendant, evidence against co-defendant, when; 44.
in action of covenant, Id.
of trespass, Id.
to get rid of an action; 78. 79.
in criminal cases, not evidence against others, 73. 74. 82.
of partner, evidence against co-partner, when, 73.
after determination of partnership, Id.
acts of party, amounting to, 171.
tenant cannot dispute his landlord's title, 171.
receipt of tythes, evidence of being parson, when, 171.
acts of ownership, acquiesced in, 132.

ADMISSION, (*continued.*)
admission, in recital of deed, 79.
in answer in Chancery, Id.
whole of, to be taken together, 79.
ADULTERY,
action for,
confession of wife not evidence for husband, 64.
conversations between her and defendant, evidence against defendant, 64.
manner of plaintiff's living with his wife may be shown; 64.
or, their letters, when living separate, 64. 65.
several acts of adultery may be proved, within the time specified; 134.
or, indecent familiarities before the time, 134.
wife's general bad character, in mitigation, 139.
or particular acts of adultery before, Id.
or that she made the first advance; 140.
the plaintiff's crim. con. with other women, 139. 140.
wife's letters to defendant, not evidence for defendant, 64.
declaration at the time of eloping, 203.
AFFIRMATION. See tit. *Quaker.*
AGENT,
admission of, when evidence against principal; 74—78.
at the time of the contract, 74. 75.
within the scope of authority, 75. 77.
receipt by agent, 75.
letter of agent, 75. 76.
proof of admission, 74. 75.
of wife, as agent of husband, 69.
competent witness for principal; 94.
to prove a sale, Id.
who, such an agent, Id.
AGREEMENT. And see tit. *Contract.*
blank in, when to be supplied by parol evidence, 418.
for lease, when a present demise, 406.
consideration, when to be specified in memorandum of, 439. 440.
discharged by parol, when, 444.
mistake in drawing of, when and how rectified, 458. 459.
parol evidence not admissible to vary or contradict; 437. 441.
as, to show that a different quality of goods was contracted for; 438.

AGREEMENT, (*continued.*)
otherwise, as to a variation in *time* or *mode* of delivery, Id. 439.
declaration of auctioneer, not to vary conditions of sale, 438. See tit. *Evidence.*
stamp not requisite, when, 405—409.
specific performance of. See tit. *Specific.*
ALIBI,
remark on proof of, 230.
AMBIGUITY,
latent, explained by parol evidence; 410.
grant of manor of S., there being two of that name; Id.
devise to two of the same name, 411.
mistake in devisee's name, Id.
in the description of the premises, 412.
in the name of the fund, Id.
patent, in deed or will, not to be so explained; 416. 417.
but the circumstances of the testator may be shown to help the construction, 417.
blank in will; 418.
in written agreement, which need not be in writing; 418.
ANSWER,
in Chancery. See tit. *Chancery.*
APPROVEMENT,
ancient doctrine of, 29.
modern practice, in its stead, 30. See tit. *Accomplice.*
ARBITRATION, (See tit. *Award.*)
ARTICLES OF THE PEACE,
exhibited by wife against husband; 68.
affidavit contradicting, not to be received, 68.
ARTICLES OF WAR,
how proved, 305.
ASSAULT,
evidence of first assault by plaintiff not admissible, under general issue, except in mitigation, 129.
what the party says at the time of receiving the hurt, when admissible, 203.
conviction for the same, not evidence in an action for the assault, 241.
several actions for, against several, defendant in one competent for a defendant in another, 37.
if defendant, under plea of *son assault*, prove the assault on the *same* day, &c. plaintiff cannot prove an assault on *another* day, 165.
ASSUMPSIT, See tit. (*Non-Assumpsit.*)
delivery of goods, proved by shop-book, when, 195—199.
plaintiff may recover less than is demanded in the writ, 154.

ASSUMPSIT, (*continued.*)
one, who has received money for defendant's use, is competent, 53.
ATHEIST,
not competent witnesses, 17.
ATTACHMENT,
of witnesses, for contempt, 4. 5.
ATTENDANCE,
of witness, at trial. See tit. *Witness.*
ATTORNEY,
evidence of being, 312.
in action by, for fees, contents of bill delivered, proved by duplicate original, 343.
bill delivered not conclusive against an additional item, 80.
not to reveal confidential communications of a client, 102—106. See tit. *Counsel.*
AVERMENT,
immaterial what, 158—160. See also, tit. *Indictment.*
AWARD,
evidence, when; and when conclusive; 235. 287.
between what parties, 179. 287.
between an occupier of land and a township, as to the liability of repairing a road, not evidence against a succeeding occupier, 179.
conclusive, on all matters referred, (whether of law or fact;) 70.
not as to matters not inquired into, 287. 288.
matter *dehors*, to show the award void, cannot be proved under plea of *no such award*, 141.
in action upon, submission and execution of award to be proved, 301.
submission of all parties, Id.

B

BAIL,
not competent witness for principal, 46.
BANK-BOOK,
evidence to prove transfer of stock, 312.
BANKRUPT,
commissioners of, their proceedings. See tit. *Commissioners.*
competent, on proof of certificate and of release to assignees of his share in the surplus; 98.
general release sufficient, Id.
competent, after second bankruptcy, when, 51. 98.
declarations by, at the time of absenting himself, 202.
incompetent to prove his own act of bankruptcy, 98.
to increase the fund; 51.

BANKRUPT, (*continued.*)
incompetent to support the commission, even after certificate and release; 51.
to prove antecedent act of bankruptcy, Id
creditor of, not competent to increase the fund, 51.
may support the commission, 52.
petitioning, cannot support the commission, 52.
wife of, may be examined as to his effects, 69.
BARGAIN AND SALE,
enrolment of; 352.
indorsement of, evidence of enrolment, when, 292. 352.
of freehold interest; 352—355.
copy of enrolment of, Id.
of chattel interest; Id.
copy of enrolment of, proof of deed against whom, 355.
BARON (Court), (See tit. *Manor-Court.*)
rolls of; 315.
ancient writings to prove custom; Id.
though not signed by a tenant, Id.
inspection of, 329.
BARRATRY,
conviction of, cause of incompetency, 23.
BASTARD,
endeavour to conceal birth of, how and when punishable, 126.
BASTARDY, (See tit. *Legitimacy.*)
appeal against order of,
married women competent to prove the crim. con.; 69. 70.
not to prove any other fact, as want of access, &c. Id.
witness not compellable to acknowledge himself the father, 206.
BIGAMY,
in prosecution for, second wife competent after proof of first marriage; 63.
exception in stat. of, where either party beyond sea for seven years, &c. 152.
second marriage, after sentence of divorce or sentence of nullity, not within the statute, 247.
BILL OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTE.
acceptor may show want of authority in the drawer to draw the bill, 54.
on a question, whether the acceptor gave authority to the drawer to draw a *particular* bill, a *general* authority for that purpose may be shown, 133.
acceptance vacated by sentence of foreign court, 252.
drawer of accommodation bill not competent for the

BILL OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTE, (*continued.*)
acceptor (the defendant) to prove, that an indorsee (the plaintiff) took the bill for an usurious consideration, 46.
indorser, whether competent to prove the consideration usurious; 33.
may prove the bill not available, for want of stamp, Id.
BILL, in Chancery. See tit. *Chancery.*
BILL OF EXCEPTION,
what, and by whom to be had, 214. 215.
on trial at bar, or at nisi prius, 214.
whether in criminal cases, 215.
not at quarter sessions, Id.
lies only where writ of error lies, Id.
BILL OF LADING,
signed by deceased master, evidence of property in the consignee, 192.
BILL OF PARTICULARS, (See tit. *Particular.*)
BIRTH,
time of, proved by the declaration of deceased parent; 180.
or by the declaration of surgeon who attended, 181.
place of, cannot be so proved, 180.
BLANK,
parol evidence to supply, when. See tit. *Evidence*, and tit. *Ambiguity.*
BOND,
alteration of, rasure, &c. avoids when, 128.
non est factum, evidence under, Id.
solvit ad diem,
presumptive evidence of payment, after 20 years, 114.
when, within that time; Id.
rebutted by proof of payment of interest, Id.
by indorsement by obligor, by obligee, Id.
BOOK,
private,
of rector deceased, evidence of ecclesiastical dues, 184. 187.
corporation. See tit. *Corporation.*
tradesmen, when evidence of delivery of goods, 195—199.
notice to produce, 336.
rule to produce, 337.

BOOK, (*continued.*)
public,
of bank, to prove transfer of stock, 312.
of master's office in K. B. to prove a person attorney, 312.
of navy-office, to prove death of a sailor, 312.
of parish, for copies of rates, 311.
for recording indentures of apprenticeship, 312.
to prove election to public office, 312. 313.
of prison, to prove *time* of commitment; 313.
not to prove the *cause*, Id.
logbook of ship, to prove time of sailing, 312.
inspection of, 328.
entry in, how proved, 320.
day-book, not evidence to contradict parish-register, 314.
of prison, evidence, when, 313.
BOUNDARY,
hearsay, evidence of, 182—184.
perambulations, evidence of, 183.
BRIBERY,
information on statute against,
party bribed, competent witness, 31.
promissory note given for bribe, evidence though unstamped, 399.
BROKER, (See tit. *Agent.*)
of policy, competent, though he has signed as underwriter, 37. 38. 100.
BURGLARY,
on indictment for burglary and for larceny, if no burglary proved nor larceny proved at the time of the supposed burglary, evidence of a larceny on a former day not admissible, 136.
prisoner may be acquitted of the burglary, and found guilty of the larceny, 156.
BURNING in the hand,
benefit of clergy without, when, 26.
competency of witness restored by it; 25.
proof of the burning, 26.
other punishment, in lieu of, 25.
BUSHEL,
sale of corn by any but Winchester bushel, illegal, 432.

C

CAMDEN,
history, whether evidence of a custom, 320.
CARRIER,
effect of payment of money into court, in action against, 144. 145.

CERTIFICATE,
of ordinary, as to legality of marriage, 244.
of English vice-consul abroad, not evidence of amount of sale of goods, 288.
CHANCERY,
decree, not made against defendant's answer, contradicted by a single witness, 60. 110.
evidence against whom, and of what, 262.
proof of; 295.
previous proceedings, when to be proved, 295.
of ancient decrees, 291.
bill, when evidence and of what, 263.
not evidence of pedigree, Id.
answer, evidence against the defendant; 264. 266.
how far evidence for him, when produced by the other party, 265.
taken altogether, not in parts, 264.
evidence for defendant, in issue on bill for discovery, when, 60.
of defendant, not evidence against co-defendant, 266.
of minor, by guardian, not evidence against him, Id.
of occupier of land, evidence against a succeeding occupier, in tithe-cause; 266, and examined copy of the answer, sufficient, Id.
of partner, evidence of joint debt against co-partner, Id.
not evidence of the partnership, 266. 267.
of wife, whether evidence against her, after husband's death, 267.
proof of answer, 296.
bill to be proved, to let in the answer, Id.
examined copy of, sufficient proof; Id.
swearing of answer presumed; Id.
on indictment for perjury, otherwise, Id.
so, in action for malicious prosecution, Id.
depositions, evidence between what parties, and when; 267.
not evidence for deponent, though made without interest, 268.
in question of pedigree, not evidence against a stranger, 180. 222.
not evidence for or against a stranger; 268.
whether in question of tolls or custom, &c. 269.
after dismissal of bill, when evidence, 269.

CHANCERY, (*continued.*)
depositions,
de bene esse, not evidence before answer put in, 270.
unless defendant in contempt, Id.
or has refused to answer, Id.
or neglected to cross-examine, 271. 272.
order for reading, on trial at law, 270. 297.
proof of depositions, 297. 298.
bill and answer must be shown, in general; 297.
exceptions, Id.
CHARACTER,
infamy of, when incapacitates a witness, 22. See tit. *Witness.*
of party to suit, examinable, if put in issue, 139.
in action to set aside a will, for fraud by defendant, evidence of his good character not admissible, 139.
nor in an information for keeping false weights, Id.
evidence in mitigation of damages, when ; 139.
in action for crim. con., wife's general bad character ; Id.
that defendant was generally suspected of the crime, is evidence in action for a libel, under general issue; otherwise, where defendant justifies ; 140.
in action for malicious prosecution, 140. (See tit. *Rape.*)
of witness, may be impeached by general evidence; 212.
not by the party producing him, Id.
how supported, if attacked, 212. 213.
of deceased subscribing witness to a will, given in evidence, when, 213. 385.
CHARTER,
explained by usage, when, 419—421.
presumed from length of possession, 119.
CHARTER-PARTY,
not to be contradicted or varied by parol evidence, 432. See tit. *Evidence.*
CHILDREN,
when competent witnesses, 14. 15.
CHIROGRAPH,
of fine, 292.
CIRCUMSTANTIAL Evidence, 124.
See tit. *Presumption.*

CLERGY,
benefit of, restores competency, when, 25.
who entitled to, without burning in the hand: 26.
COGNOVIT,
need not be stamped ; 406.
otherwise, if it contains an agreement, Id.
COLLEGE,
sentence of expulsion by, when conclusive, 259. 260.
COMMISSIONERS,
of bankrupt,
may compel witness to attend, 6.
may examine bankrupt's wife, 69.
proceedings of, evidence of the time of bankruptcy after the witness's death, 273. 274.
conclusive of debt, in action for creditor's share, 275.
evidence of petitioning creditor's debt, &c., in actions by or against the assignees, unless notice be given, &c. ; 274.
not *conclusive*, though no notice, 275.
not evidence, between other persons not claiming under the commissioners, 275.
on indictment for perjury before the commissioners, strict proof of the bankruptcy is necessary, 276.
produced from the proper custody—and hand-writing of a commissioner must be proved, 275.
by act of parliament,
sentence of, when conclusive, 262.
of excise,
condemnation by, conclusive of right of seizure 254. 258.
depositions before, in presence of the other party, and signed by witness, evidence after the witness's death, 286.
of enclosure,
may summon witnesses, 7.
COMMON,
by custom,
other commoners incompetent, if the custom the same. 44. 45.
proof of, by hearsay. See tit. *Custom.*
by prescription,
hearsay, evidence of a prescriptive right abridging a general right, 190. 191.
though general right not set out on the record. Id.

COMMON, (*continued.*)
by prescription,
others claiming under, competent, 45.
by vicinage,
one commoner not competent for another, 45.
COMMON-RECOVERY,
deed to make a tenant to the writ of entry, when evidence of, 295.
COMPARISON of hand-writing, 371—373.
See tit. *Hand-writing.*
COMPETENCY,
of witness. See tit. *Witness.*
COMPOSITION,
real, for tithes, not presumed from usage, 119.
CONCEALMENT,
of birth of bastard child, how punishable, 126.
CONDEMNATION,
sentence of, in Exchequer. (See tit. *Exchequer*, and *Commissioners.*)
CONDITION,
in deed,
parol evidence not admissible to vary, 424.
of sale,
not to be varied by declarations of auctioneer, 438.
CONFESSION,
of prisoner, evidence against him; 81. 82.
not evidence against others, 82. 83.
to be taken altogether, 83.
on examination before magistrate, though not signed by prisoner, 82.
prisoner not to be on oath, Id.
under threat or promise, not evidence; 81.
discovery, in consequence of, may be shown, 83.
in high treason, 84.
sufficient to convict, when, 84. 85.
evidence of collateral facts, 85.
on death-bed; 201.
of witness to a will, evidence against the will; 201.
evidence of good character of other witnesses deceased, in answer, 213.
CONSENT,
on indictment for coursing deer "*without the consent of the owner*," the want of consent must be shown, 151.
CONSIDERATION,
of agreement, within s. 4. of stat. of frauds, must be stated; 439.
as, of promise to pay debt of third persons; Id.
of bargain, within s. 17. need not, 441.
in deed, 424.
another may be proved, besides that; 424—427.

CONSIDERATION, (*continued.*)
though no consideration stated, 425. 426.
or "for divers considerations;" 425. 426.
of greater or less value, 426.
different consideration may be shown, in case of fraud, &c., 427.
not by party supporting the deed, 426.
CONSPIRACY,
on indictment for, the wife of one defendant not a witness for the others, 65. 66.
the act of one, in pursuance of the original plan, evidence against the rest, 74.
what one has said, as to the share of another in the transaction, or as to the common object, is not evidence against that other, Id.
conviction of, renders incompetent, when, 23.
CONSTABLE,
appointment of, need not be proved, when; 78.
proof of acting as such, Id.
CONTRACT,
marine,
between master of ship and seamen to be in writing; 433.
not void, though not in writing; Id.
if in writing, not to be varied by parol evidence, Id.
to be produced by the master, 337.
mercantile,
usage, when evidence, in construction of, 432. 434. 435.
of service for year, wages due in proportion to the time of service, 436.
to be proved, as set out on the record; 158. 160.
article, as to *liquidation of damages*, need not be set out, 161.
CONVICTION,
on game laws, 150.
whether necessary to disprove all the qualifications, 150.
by magistrate,
when to be drawn up; 324.
conclusive evidence for him, in an action, until quashed, 260—262.
for not repairing a road, evidence of liability, 224. 232.
for assault, not evidence in action for, 241.
of bigamy, evidence against legality of marriage in a civil action, 240.
of principal, evidence against accessary, when, 229. 230.
in criminal cases, whether evidence in civil, 88. 237—241.
not conclusive as to the *time* of committing the offence, 219.

CONVICTION, (*continued.*)
party convicted, entitled to copy of conviction, 324.
rewards, for prosecuting to conviction, in what cases, 86.
witness, incompetent on conviction, when; 22. 23., &c.
proof of judgment, necessary, 24.
COPY, (and see tit. *Duplicate. Enrolment. Writing.*)
of record, 289.
under great seal, Id.
seal of court, 290.
examined copy, 291.
proof of, 291.
office copy, 291. 292.
authenticated by proper officer, 292.
of depositions, not evidence in other courts, 292.
of record of acquittal, how obtained, 322.
of deed, &c., not evidence, when the original can be produced, 167.
of proceedings before commissioners of bankrupt, 273. 274.
of inferior jurisdictions, 325—328.
of entries in public books, 320. 321.
rule, to obtain copies of, 328—333.
COPYHOLD,
not devisable, within stat. of wills, 374.
devise of, good as declaration of uses; Id.
attestation and signature, not necessary; Id.
unless required by the terms of the surrender, Id.
paper, signed by copyholders, evidence as to customs, 194.
CORONER. See tit. *Depositions, Inquisition.*
CORPORATION,
books of, evidence between the members, 319.
not against strangers, Id.
entry in, to be made by proper officer, 320.
proper custody of, to be shown; 319. 320.
corporator may produce, 350.
inspection of, 330—332.
deed of, does not require delivery; 361.
members of, competent witnesses, when; 57. 59. 98.
disfranchised, how, 98. 99.
seal of, how proved, 291.
COSTS,
persons liable to, not competent; 46.
bail not competent for principal; 46.
rated inhabitants, not incompetent on this ground, 47.
governors of poor-house, if liable to costs, individually, are not competent; 57.
competent, if liable only in a corporate capacity, Id.

COSTS, (*continued.*)
sheriff's officer, who indemnifies, not competent, 46.
of prosecution, when allowed, 87.
on taxation of, expense of witness from abroad allowed, when, 3.
of depositions taken abroad, not allowed, 11.
COUNSEL,
professional confidence with client, 102—106.
confidential communications not to be given in evidence, 103.
though proceedings finished; 103.
not in actions between third persons,
nor after dismissal of solicitor; Id.
what communications privileged, Id.
solicitor and attorney within same rule, Id.
so, interpreter between counsel and client, Id.
person not an attorney, though considered as such, not within the rule, Id.
of what facts, they may give evidence, 105.
third person, who hears the communication, may speak to it, 103. 104.
communications to other persons not privileged, 104.
COUNTERFEIT-MONEY. See tit. *Uttering.*
COUNTY,
inhabitant of, competent on indictment for non-repair of bridge, when, 93.
COURT. See tit. *Admiralty*, *Chancery*, *Ecclesiastical.*
of exclusive jurisdiction, 241. See tit. *Judgment.*
of inferior jurisdiction, 298.
proceedings in, how proved; 296. 298.
whether a party has a right to a copy of, and when, 325—328.
COVENANT. See tit. *Deed.*
COVERTURE,
evidence of, under *non-assumpsit*, 127.
under *non est factum*, 128.
on plea of, if it appears that the husband went abroad above seven years before the commencement of the suit, the defendant ought to prove him alive within that time, 153.
CREDITOR,
of bankrupt, when competent, 51. See tit. *Bankrupt.*
CRIMEN FALSI,
conviction of, incapacitates witness, 22.
CRIMES,
what incapacitate a witness, 22. 23.
CRIMINAL CONVERSATION. See tit. *Adultery.*
CROSS-EXAMINATION. See tit. *Witness.*
CUSTOM. And see tit. *Tolls.*
that lord of manor shall have common in all the lands demised, void, 430.

CUSTOM, (*continued.*)
not admissible, to show time of entering or quitting a farm different from that expressed in the lease ; 430.
" to quit at Michaelmas" means New Michaelmas, 431.
right by, though not expressed in lease ; 429.
as, for heriot,
or way-going crop, Id.
proof of, by hearsay, 182. 189.
hearsay of deceased person, though he claimed under the custom, 183. 184.
verdict, though between other parties, 233.
depositions not evidence against stranger to former suit, 180.
paper signed by copyholders, 194.
court-rolls of manor, and ancient writings, 187. 188. 315. 316.
proof of custom, in adjoining parish or manor, not evidence ; 130.
otherwise, on a question of *tenure* in one of several connected manors, 130.

D

DAY-BOOK. See tit. *Book.*
DEAF AND DUMB,
how to give evidence, 13.
DEATH,
abroad, evidence of, 152. 175.
presumed, at the expiration of seven years, &c. 152.
death-bed declarations. See tit. *Declarations.*
on issue as to the death of a particular person, the party asserting the death has to prove it, 152.
DEBT. (See tit. *Bond, Deed, Non est factum.*)
on foreign judgment—the judgment prima facie evidence, 252. 253.
DECLARATIONS. See tit. *Admissions, Evidence, Hearsay.*
on death-bed,
in criminal cases, evidence, when ; 200.
whether made in extremes, a question for the Court, 200.
of accomplice, 201.
of attainted person, not evidence, Id.
in civil cases, evidence, 201.
confession of subscribing witness to will, Id. See tit. *Confession.*
DECREE. See tit. *Chancery.*
DEED. See tit. *Writing.*
ambiguity in, how explained. See tit. *Ambiguity.*
ancient, explained by usage, when, 421.
non est factum, evidence under. See tit. *Non est factum.*

DEED, (*continued.*)
presumed from usage, when, 119. 120.
variance in proof of, 162.
execution of, proved by subscribing witness; 356. 357. 358.
signing; 358.
not essential to a deed, Id.
required by statute of frauds, when, Id.
attestation of, in deeds under powers, 358—360.
sealing; 360.
delivery, what sufficient; 361.
on another day may be shown, 428.
subscribing witness may prove it forged, 32.
when subscribing witness not producible, how proved; 362. 363.
proof of party's signature, when sufficient, 363. 364.
need not be proved, when; 349—352.
1. deed 30 years old; 349.
custody of, to be shown, when, 349.
2. deed enrolled; 352. See tit. *Enrolment.*
3. recital, when evidence against the party to reciting deed, 356.
4. deed produced under order of Court. 356.
mistake in, when rectified in equity, 458.
parol evidence, not admissible to vary or add to, 424—432.
except in case of fraud, &c. 427.
another consideration may be shown; 424—427. See tit. *Consideration,* and *Evidence.*
or different day of delivery, 428.
notice to produce, 336. See tit. *Notice.*
produced under notice, proved by the other party, when; 343.
when not, 345.
counterpart, evidence against the party, without notice to produce the original, 340.
profert dispensed with, when, 348.
secondary evidence of, when admissible; 346. 347.
proof of the loss, &c. of written instrument, 347. 348.
DEFAULT,
judgment by, its effect, as an admission, 141.
defendant, after judgment by, not competent for or against a plaintiff, in action on joint contract, 62.

DEFAULT, (*continued.*)
competent for co-defendant in trover, 63.
DEFENDANT,
discharged and made witness, when, 61.
submitting to fine, on indictment for assault, may be witness for another defendant, 62.
suffering judgment by default, in case of misdemeanour, 62.
or, in action on joint contract, not witness for or against plaintiff. Id.
in trespass, witness for another, when the trespasses are different, 61.
in ejectment, how made witness, 62.
witness made defendant by mistake—may be struck out, 63.
in an information, nolle prosequi entered, 63.
DEMAND,
particular of. See tit. *Particular.*
DEMURRER TO EVIDENCE,
what, 215.
facts admitted, 216.
counsel for the crown not compellable to join, 217.
not allowed in the king's case, 113.
under the control of the Court, 217.
DEPOSITIONS. See tit. *Examinations.*
de bene esse, 10.
by consent; 10. 272.
when evidence, 272. 273.
on question of pedigree, not evidence against a stranger to the first suit, 176—179.
evidence of custom, when, 269.
not evidence against strangers to the former suit, 180. 222. 269.
In Chancery. See tit. *Chancery.*
in ecclesiastical court, 286.
before commissioners of bankrupt. } See tit. *Commissioners.*
commissioners of excise. }
before coroner, under stat. Ph. & M., 279.
must contain the *effect* of the evidence; 279. 280.
to be certified together with the inquisition; 279.
taken upon oath; 82.
need not be taken in the presence of prisoner; 280.
evidence on trial of prisoner, when, 280.
before magistrate, under stat. of Ph. & M. 276—279.
in case of felony, how taken; 276. 277.
how certified and transmitted; 276. 279.

DEPOSITIONS, (*continued.*)
need not be signed by deponent; 277. 278.
evidence against prisoner, when, 277.
in misdemeanors or civil cases, not evidence, 278.
in petty treason, not sufficient to convict of the treason, but will support a conviction for the murder, 278.
evidence for prisoner, to contradict witness, 212. 279. 325.
prisoner has no right to copy of, 324.
conviction, purporting to set out deposition, not evidence, 212.
of pauper. See tit. *Examination.*
of witness abroad or going abroad, when evidence; 272. 273.
of witness in India, 273.
proof of; 297.
office copy, not evidence in other courts; 292.
attested by judge's clerk, 292.
DEVISE. See tit. *Will.*
DOOMSDAY-BOOK.
account of, 302. 303.
when evidence. Id.
DUGDALE,
baronage, not evidence to prove a descent, 320.
monasticon, not evidence as to the order of a monastery. Id.
DUPLICATE ORIGINAL.
of notice to produce, notice to quit, &c. 342. 343.
taken by copying machine, not evidence, 343.

E

EASEMENT,
grant of, presumed from 20 years enjoyment, 120—124.
as against the reversioner, when; 123.
presumed from shorter enjoyment, when, 121.
See tit. *Presumption.*
ECCLESIASTICAL COURT,
suit in,
number of witnesses to prove a fact; 110.
proof of temporal matter arising incidentally, 110.
depositions in, when evidence, 286.
sentence of, 243—248.
of nullity, or in affirmance of marriage, conclusive on question of legitimacy, when, 243.
conclusive on trial for polygamy; 247.

ECCLESIASTICAL COURT, (*continued.*)
sentence of,
in a cause of jactitation, evidence in ejectment; not conclusive; 244. 245.
much less, in criminal prosecutions, 246.
evidence between what parties; 243.
when conclusive as to all. 243. 244.
impeachable for fraud, 248.
on validity of will, and right of administration, conclusive, 245. See tit. *Probate.*
proof of, 298. 330.
ledger-book, when evidence, 299.
EJECTMENT,
judgment in, conclusive in action for mesne profits, when, 224.
tenant in possession not competent for defendant, under whom he holds, 48.
witness, who is to have a lease of the lands (if recovered), not competent for the plaintiff, 48.
witness, called by defendant, not competent to prove himself the real tenant, and defendant his bailiff, 52.
notice to quit at a certain time, served personally and not objected to, evidence of the time of entry; 80.
proved by duplicate original; 343.
if attested, proved by subscribing witness. 357.
ENDOWMENT
of vicarage, when presumed, 119.
ENROLMENT,
of bargain and sale, under stat. of H. 8. 292. 352.
indorsement, when evidence of, 292.
copy of, when evidence of execution, 352.
of other deeds, when evidence, 355.
ENTRY,
in books, by receiver of money, against interest, 191. 192.
ESTOPPEL,
by judgment or verdict, when, 119.
EVIDENCE,
admissibility of, a question for the judge, 13.
written or unwritten; 218.
writings, public or private;
public, of record or not of record;
public writings not of record, judicial or not judicial, Id.
bill of exceptions to. See tit. *Bill of Exception.*
demurrer to. See tit. *Demurrer to Evidence.*
presumptive. See tit. *Presumption.*

EVIDENCE, (*continued.*)
general rules of.
1. Evidence confined to points in issue, 126.
under plea of non-assumpsit, 126. See tit. *Non-assumpsit.*
non est factum, 128. See tit. *Non est factum.*
not guilty in trespass, 129. See tit. *Trespass.*
under issue on custom, 130. See tit. *Manor, Custom.*
proof of *other* acts when admissible; 133.
on a question, whether the acceptors had given authority to the drawer to draw a *particular* bill payable to a fictitious person, a *general* authority may be shown, 133.
in trespass, what or how many acts of trespass may be shown, 134.
in action for slander, when other actionable words may be proved, 134.
on trial for treason, no overt-act of a distinct treason can be proved, 136.
on indictment for infamous offence, proof that defendant has a general disposition to commit such offences, or that he has committed such an offence at another time, is not evidence, 136.
when *other* acts of the prisoner are evidence against him, as showing his intentions, *contemporaneous* acts are also evidence in his favour, 138.
on indictment for uttering forged notes or counterfeit money, proof of his uttering others similar, admissible, 137.
character of either party, when examinable in civil suit, 139. See tit. *Character.*
facts admitted on record, need not to be proved; 141.
cannot be contradicted, 141.
2. The affirmative of the issue to be proved, 150.
in action on game-laws, plaintiff need not disprove the several qualifications; 150.
whether such evidence necessary to support a conviction by magistrates, 150.
negative, when to be proved; 151.
where breach of duty alleged, 151.
where a person is charged with doing the act complained of "without giving due notice," 151.
on indictment for coursing deer "without the consent of the owner," 151.
on an issue upon the death of a particular person, the party asserting the death has to prove it, 152.
3. Substance only of the issue need be proved, 153.
plea of payment of principal sum and interest—sufficient to prove that a gross sum was paid and accepted as full payment, 153.

EVIDENCE, (*continued.*)
proof of tender and refusal sufficient proof of an averment of payment, when, 154.
in action of waste—sufficient to prove, that defendant cut a less number of trees; 154.
in action on simple contract, plaintiff may prove less than the writ demands; 154.
in action against sheriff, plaintiff declares that he had J. S. and his wife in execution, proof that he had only J. S. is sufficient, 154.
in action for slander, rule as to the proof of the words, 154.
proof that A. was churchwarden not sufficient on issue, whether A. and B. were churchwardens, 156.
averment, that the cattle (damage-feasant) were levant and couchant, is not proved by showing that part of them were so, 156.
averment, that plaintiff was constable of a particular parish, is not supported by proof, that he was sworn in to serve for a liberty, of which the parish was only part, 156.
(See other examples under tit. *Murder. Principal.*)
averments immaterial, when, 158. 159.
contracts to be truly stated, and proved as stated, 158—160.
4. The best evidence to be given, 167.
meaning of the rule, 167.
copy of deed not evidence, when the deed can be produced, Id.
parol evidence of license from the crown not admissible, 167.
strongest possible evidence not necessary; 169.
execution of deed proved by single witness; Id.
hand-writing proved or disproved by witness acquainted with writer's style, 169. 170.
exceptions to general rule, 170.
copy of entry in public books; 170.
appointment of constables, &c. need not be proved; 170. 171.
where the party, against whom the secondary evidence is offered, has precluded himself from disputing it, 171. See tit. *Admission.*
5. Hearsay, not evidence, 173.
See tit. *Hearsay.*
parol evidence, when admissible with reference to written instruments, 410, &c.
to explain latent ambiguity; 410. &c.
See tit. *Ambiguity.*

EVIDENCE, (*continued.*)
to explain mistake in will, 411.
as to devisee, 411. 414.
fund, 412.
description of property, 412.
or in entry of surrender of copyhold, 290.
to explain latent ambiguity; 416.
blank in will; 418.
in agreement, which need not have been written, 418. 419.
in instrument, kept to record a fact; 419.
blank in bishop's register, Id.
not to control or enlarge a will; 423.
parol evidence to show fraud, 428.
not to contradict, vary, or add to terms of deed; 424.
as to show different condition, or another use. Id.
another consideration may be shown, when; 424. 427.
consideration contrary to the deed, cannot be shown, except to show fraud, &c. 427.
delivery on a different day may be shown, 428.
customary right may be shown, though not expressed in deed, when; 429.
as for heriot, or way-going crop; Id.
if inconsistent with the deed, it cannot be shown, 429. 430.
words having a legal meaning, how to be understood, 431. 432.
parol evidence not to contradict policy of insurance, 432.
charter-party, 433.
promissory notes, 433.
mercantile contracts; 433.
usage regarded in construction of, 434—436.
not to contradict, 307.
not to contradict agreement within stat. of frauds; 437—441.
(See tit. *Agreement.*)
collateral facts, to show the meaning of contracting parties, when admissible, 443. 444.
usage, to explain ancient charter, 419.
deed; 421.
terms of admission to copyhold, 421.
covenants not to be construed by party's acts, 422.
parol agreement discharged by parol; 444—447.
discharge of, a good defence in equity to bill for specific performance, 446.

EVIDENCE, (*continued.*)
rule in equity, same as at law, as to admissibility of parol evidence; 448.
rule as to defendant, on a bill for specific performance, 449—451.
as to plaintiff; 451—458.
rule as to rectifying mistakes in deeds; &c. 458.
raising trusts in wills, 460.
secondary evidence, when allowed, 170. 346.
EXAMINATION. See tit. *Deposition.*
of pauper, not evidence on question of settlement against appellant parish, 283.
of single woman pregnant, evidence against reputed father after death, 284.
though he was not present, 284. 285.
of soldier, (under mutiny act), when evidence on question of settlement, 285.
attested copy, given to commanding officer, evidence, Id.
not evidence, if the soldier abroad, or dead, or out of the army, 285. 286.
of witness. See tit. *Witness.*
EXCEPTION, (Bill of,) see tit. *Bill of Exception.*
EXCHEQUER,
judgment in rem in, 231.
of condemnation, conclusive evidence of right of seizure, 254.
as to all persons. Id.
of acquittal, whether conclusive as to illegality of seizure, 258.
EXCISE, see tit. *Commissioners.*
EXCOMMUNICATION,
witness not incompetent from, 18.
EXECUTION,
of deed or will, see tit. *Deed. Will.*
EXECUTOR, see tit. *Probate.*
proof of being appointed, 299.
de son tort, not incompetent, as liable to actions, 40.
EXEMPLIFICATION,
of record, under great seal, 289.
under seal of court, 290.
of deed or will, not evidence, 290. 355.

F

FACTOR, see tit. *Agent.*
FELONY,
conviction of, renders incompetent, 22.
FEME SOLE,
in action by woman as, defendant cannot call the husband to prove the marriage, 64.

FENCES,
on question of liability to repair, commoners not competent, 45.
FINE,
chirograph, evidence of, 292.
copy of proclamations by chirographer, not evidence. Id.
proclamations how proved, Id.
FISHERY,
entry of licences in court rolls, evidence for person claiming under lord of manor; 187.
though payment under the licence not proved, Id.
FOREIGN COURTS, see tit. *Admiralty.*
sentence of, establishing a marriage, conclusive, when; 252.
of acquittal on charge of murder; 252.
vacating acceptance of bill of exchange; Id.
prima facie evidence of debt, in action on foreign judgment, 252. 253.
proof of; 301.
foreign law, how proved, 387.
FORFEITURE,
conviction, not conclusive as to the *time* of offence, unless specially found, 219. 240.
FORGERY,
conviction of, renders incompetent, 22.
party injured, incompetent witness on indictment, when; 88—91.
incompetent to prove forgery, 88.
or other material fact; 88.
may prove a fact merely collateral, 89.
hand-writing how disproved, 170. 373.
seal forged, proved by seal engravers, 210.
forged instrument evidence, without stamp, 400.
FRAUDS, (Statute of), see tit. *Statute.*

G

GAME-LAWS,
action on,
plaintiff need not disprove the qualifications, 150.
conviction on,
whether good, without such negative evidence; Id.
only general evidence, at least, necessary, 151.
party convicted, to be imprisoned only in case of want of distress, 261.
GAZETTE,
evidence of public acts, when, 305.
of proclamations, public addresses, &c. Id.
not of presentations, or promotions, &c. 306.

GAZETTE, (*continued.*)
evidence of notice of dissolution of partnership, when, 306.
GRANT,
ancient, explained by usage, 421. 422.
possession of, to be shown, when, 317.
presumed from length of possession ; 119.
as against reversioner, when : 123.
co-extensive with the enjoyment, 122.
See tit. *Usage. Easement. Presumption.*
GUARDIAN,
not competent, in action by infant, 46.
answer of minor by, evidence against guardian, 266.

H

HABEAS CORPUS,
writ of, for bringing up witness in custody, 9.
HAND-WRITING,
proof of, by one who has seen the person write, 364—366.
or who has received letters from him, 367—370.
in case of Alg. Sidney, 365.
in case of seven bishops, 371—373.
comparison of, not allowed ; 371—378.
otherwise, in case of ancient writings, 372—374.
forgery of, how proved, 373.
HEARSAY,
general rule as to ; 173.
exceptions,
evidence on question of pedigree, as to the state of the family, 174. 175.
declarations, papers, &c. in the family, recitals in family deeds, &c. when evidence, 174—176.
declarations of deceased husband, as to legitimacy of wife, 176.
of deceased parent, to prove time of birth, 180.
not to prove *place* of birth, 180.
or want of access. Id.
not evidence, if made post litem mortam, 176—178. 183.
or if the relative alive, 176.
depositions, or answer, in a former suit, not evidence against a stranger, 177—179.
hearsay of boundaries, or custom, 182—184.
tradition of particular fact, not evidence, 184.

HEARSAY, (*continued.*)
of *public* rights; 183. 189.
whether evidence of *private* rights, 189. 190.
entry of receipt of rent by deceased person, not evidence for one claiming under him, 188.
evidence *against* such person; 193.
how proved, 195.
entry by deceased rector, as to ecclesiastical dues; 184—187.
in tradesman's book, evidence of delivery of goods, 195—199.
declarations, or entries in books, against interest. 191—194.
by steward, &c. charging himself; 191. 192.
by person, that certain goods were not his property; 193. 194.
by occupier of land, as to the extent of adjoining tenant's land; 194.
not evidence, if the person alive, 195.
testimony of witness in former trial, when evidence, the witness being dead, or kept away by the other party, 199.
dying declarations, 200. see tit. *Declarations.*
part of *res gesta*, when evidence; 202.
declaration by bankrupt, in absenting himself, Id.
by woman at the time of elopement, Id.
at the time of receiving a bodily hurt, Id.
by deceased, as to being relieved by a parish, 181.
as to his state of health, 181. 203.
declaration by agent.—See tit. *Agent.*
HERALDS' BOOKS,
evidence on question of pedigree, 318.
visitation books of counties, evidence, Id.
account of, Id.
HERIOT,
due by custom, though not expressed in lease, 429.
HIGHWAY,
See tit. *Road,*
HIRING,
declaration of deceased servant, not evidence of, 181.
HISTORY,
general, when evidence, 320.
Speed's Chronicles, Id.
not evidence of private rights, 320.

HISTORY, (*continued.*)
Dugdale's Monasticon,
Baronage.
Camden's Britannia, Id.
HOUSE OF LORDS,
journals, see tit. *Journals.*
judgment of, how proved, 298.
HUNDRED,
in action against, the party robbed is competent, 57.
to prove the robbery; Id.
not to prove other facts,
as the Venue, Id.
HUSBAND AND WIFE, (see also tit. *Adultery, Feme sole.*)
of party to suit, incompetent for or against each other; 63. 64.
though divorced for adultery, 66.
or the other consent, Id.
declarations of wife not evidence against the man, 64.
not allowed to give any evidence that may tend to criminate the other; 66.
on proof of A.'s marriage, a witness cannot prove a *former* marriage between himself and A. 66. 67.
the party calling a witness, cannot call his wife to contradict him, 66. 67.
on a question, whether goods are the property of a man or his wife, he is not competent to prove the latter fact, 65.
on indictment for conspiracy, the wife of one defendant is not witness for the rest, 65. 66.
exceptions to general rule, 67.
in prosecution for taking a woman by force and marrying her, Id.
in case of bigamy, 2d wife competent after proof of first marriage, 68.
in offences against woman's person, 68.
wife may exhibit articles of the peace against him, 68.
or apply for information; 68.
not witness against him in treason, 69.
dying declarations of wife, evidence against him, 68.
in action between third persons, where the wife's evidence may lead to a demand against husband; 71.
in appeal against order of bastardy, married women may prove the criminal connexion, 69.
but cannot prove non-access, 70.
in suit between third persons, wife may disprove her marriage, 70.
woman, cohabiting and passing as wife, whether witness for the man, 70.
declarations of wife employed as agent by husband, 69.

HUSBAND AND WIFE, (*continued.*)
wife of bankrupt may be examined by commissioners, when, 69.
answer by wife, whether evidence against her, after husband's death, 267.

I

INCOMPETENCY,
of witness. See tit. *Witness.*
INDICTMENT,
averment in, when need not be proved; 159.
in indictment for robbery *near the highway*, Id.
in the house *of A. B.* Id.
for arson *in the night-time*, Id.
for murder *of officer in execution of office*, 158.
for burglary in the house of J. D. with intent to steal the property of J. W., the averment of property is material, 160.
for felony at a certain place, and no such place in the county, the indictment void, 166.
copy of, in felony, not to be had by defendant without order of Court; 322.
but if produced, admissible, though without order; 323.
in misdemeanors, order not necessary, 324.
INFAMY
of character, cause of incompetency, 22. 23.
from what offences, Id.
INFANCY,
may be given in evidence under non-assumpsit, 127.
not under non est factum, 128.
INFANT,
competent witness, when, 14. 15.
answer of, by guardian, not evidence against him, 266.
INFIDEL,
incompetent witness, when, 17.
INFORMER,
incompetent witness at common law, when, 91.
competent, when, 92. 93.
INHABITANTS,
of county, competent on indictment for non-repair of bridge, when; 93.
of hundred, in action by party robbed; 93.
of parish, where penalty given to the poor, when competent; 93.
in prosecutions under highway act, 93.

INHABITANTS, (*continued.*)
rated, competent in parish-appeal, by stat. 54 G. 3. c. 170. 93.
declarations by, evidence against their parish; 60. 72.
not compellable to give evidence against, 60. 208.
INQUISITION,
by coroner, bad, if evidence brought by the accused party was rejected, 281.
of lunacy, by coroner, whether evidence against one claiming as executor; 239.
evidence for prisoner; 282.
post mortem, 174.
of felo de se, evidence against executor or administrator; 281.
not conclusive, Id.
finding, that the party fled for it, whether conclusive, 281.
of office, evidence against whom, 282.
by escheators, commissioners, sheriff, &c. 282.
by order of H. of Com. respecting fees, 282.
not evidence, when irregularly taken; 283.
inquisition by sheriff's jury, on question of property, Id.
proof of; 283.
commission ought, regularly, to be shown, Id.
INSPECTION,
of records; 322.
depositions, not allowed to prisoner before trial, 325.
proceedings before inferior jurisdictions, when allowed; 325—328.
parish books, and books in public offices; 311. 312. 328.
court rolls; 329.
corporation books, 330—332.
rule for, not allowed in criminal cases; 332—333.
otherwise, in informations in nature of quo warranto, 333.
rule to inspect, after issue joined; 333. 334.
where no action depending, 334.
INTEREST,
incapacitates witness, when, 34.
See tit. *Witness.*
INTERROGATORIES, see tit. *Witness.*
ISSUE,
evidence to be confined to points in; 126.
affirmative of, to be proved; 150.
substance of, alone, need be proved; 153.
} See tit. *Evidence.*

J

JACTITATION OF MARRIAGE,
sentence in cause of. See tit. *Ecclesiastical Court.*
JOURNALS,
of the House of Lords, 305.
proof of judgment on appeal.
of address to the king; Id.
not evidence of the facts stated in the judgment, Id.
of House of Commons; Id.
proof of entry in, 321.
JUDGMENT, (See tit. *Verdict.*)
by default, its effect, as an admission, 141.
of court of record, when evidence in a cause; 222—237.
between what parties; 222. 223.
who may plead a judgment in bar, and when, 223.
conclusive as evidence between the *same parties.* when, 223. 226.
judgment recovered, conclusive evidence in assumpsit, 234.
in ejectment, conclusive in trespass for mesne profits, 224.
judgment of quarter sessions, 224. 231.
conviction for nonrepair of a road, 224.
judgment in court of conscience, 225.
evidence between *privies* to the first suit; 226.
not evidence for a party *against a stranger*, 228.
or *for a stranger* against a party; 230.
exception in the case of customs, tolls, and public rights, 233.
decree between vicar and impropriator, evidence between succeeding vicars and impropriators; 227.
judgment concerning office of schoolmaster, evidence for or against a successor, 227.
judgment of ouster in an information in the nature of quo warranto; 227.
in rem in the Exchequer, 231.
on what points evidence, 234. 235.
judgment in debt, bar in assumpsit, when, 235.
in trespass, bar in trover, when, Id.
in trover, bar in assumpsit, 235.
in criminal cases, whether evidence in civil, 237—241.
of court of exclusive jurisdiction, 242.
when conclusive, when not evidence, 242.
impeachable for fraud, 242.

JUDGMENT, (*continued.*)
of ecclesiastical court. See tit. *Ecclesiastical.*
admiralty court. See tit. *Admiralty.*
exchequer. See tit. *Exchequer.*
commissioners of excise. See tit. *Commissioner.*
sentence by members of college, when conclusive, 259.
proceedings before commissioners of bankrupt, 273.
See tit. *Commissioners.*
conviction by magistrate, 260.
conclusive for him, in an action, when; 260—262.
informality of, cannot be taken advantage of, Id.
of inferior courts, when evidence, and to what extent, 287.
of foreign court. See tit. *Foreign.*
proof of, 289. 291. 293. 295. 298. 301.
copy of judgment, signed by the master, not evidence, 291.
JURISDICTION, See tit. *Courts.*
JUROR,
challenge of, for kindred, 13.
JUSTICE OF PEACE. See tit. *Magistrate.*

L

LARCENY,
witness not incompetent for petty, 22. 26.
what sufficient property to maintain indictment, 118.
LEADING QUESTION,
not to be put to witness in general; 205.
allowed in cross-examination; Id.
in examination in chief, when, Id.
LEASE,
ancient, when evidence; 187.
though possession under not shown. Id.
on life, death presumed, when, 152.
LEGITIMACY,
birth during marriage, presumptive evidence of; 112.
how rebutted, Id.
birth after divorce a mensa, &c., presumed to be illegitimate, 113. 152.
declarations of deceased person, to disprove his supposed marriage, 180.
of husband, as to legitimacy of wife, 176.
sentence of nullity of marriage, or in affirmance of, conclusive, when, 243.
LETTERS PATENT,
exemplification, evidence of, 355.
LIBEL,
in action for, other libels when evidence, 134. 135.
evidence, that defendant was generally suspected, &c. 140.

LIBEL, (*continued.*)
magistrate's clerk not compellable to say, whether he delivered to the magistrate an affidavit containing the libel, 206.
LICENSE,
from the crown, how proved, 167.
old licenses from lord of a manor, for fishing, &c.; 187.
license to enclose, when presumed, 121.
LUNACY,
coroner's inquest, 239. See tit. *Inquisition.*

M

MAGISTRATE,
action against,
proof of notice, 343.
conviction by. See tit. *Conviction.*
depositions taken by. See tit. *Depositions.*
compellable, by order of court to grant copy of conviction, and of information, 324. 326.
MAHOMETAN,
may be witness, 17. 18.
to be sworn on the Koran, 20.
MALICIOUS PROSECUTION,
in action for, general bad character of plaintiff may be shown, when, 140.
copy of indictment, how obtained, 322.
evidence, if produced, though without order, 323.
MANOR,
custom of. See tit. *Custom.*
survey of. See tit. *Survey.*
proof of custom in one manor not evidence of a custom in adjoining manor; 130.
otherwise, on a question of tenure in a district of manors, 130. 131.
MANOR COURT,
proceedings in, evidence between whom, 287.
rolls of, evidence between the lord and his tenants; 315.
ancient writings of, evidence of descent, though not signed, 315.
inspection of, 329.
proof of, 298.
MARRIAGE,
hearsay of, in family, 174.
legality of, determined by ecclesiastical courts directly, 243.
by courts of common law incidentally. Id.
proof of, on real writs; 244.
by parish register, 307.

MARRIAGE, (*continued.*)
sentence of ecclesiastical court, annulling, 243.
conviction of bigamy, proof of illegality of second marriage, in civil action, 240.
in foreign country, established by sentence in foreign court, 252.
MEASURE,
sale of a number of acres of land, generally, means acres by statute measure, 432.
sale of corn by the bushel means by the Winchester bushel, Id.
MEMORANDUM,
written, to refresh memory; 199. 209.
agreement unsigned, used as, 160.
unstamped receipt, 386.
MERCHANTS' BOOKS,
evidence of what, and when, 195—199. 347.
MESNE PROFITS,
judgment in ejectment conclusive of right of possession in action for, 224. 236.
MISTAKE,
in deed, rectified in equity, when, 458. 459.
in will, may be shown, when, 411. 419.
MITIGATION,
of damages, what evidence allowed in, 139. 140.
MODUS. See tit. *Tithes.*
on question of, persons liable to tithes not competent, 45.
proof of, by usage, 119.
de non decimando, not proved by usage alone, 119.
declarations of deceased occupier, evidence of parochial modus, 183. 184.
proof that a particular person paid so much in lieu of tythes, not evidence, 184.
MONEY,
payment of, into Court—its effect, 142. 143.
money cannot be recovered back, though paid by mistake, 142.
admission of *legal* demand, 142. 144.
payment generally upon the whole declaration, 142. 143.
dispenses with proof of hand-writing, in action on bill of exchange, 143.
and dispenses with proper stamp; Id.
admits the jurisdiction of the Court; Id.
admits the contract, to what extent; 144.
in action against a carrier, 144. 145.
proof of, 145.
MURDER,
conviction of, on indictment for petit treason, 156.

MURDER, (*continued.*)
conviction of manslaughter, on indictment for murder, 157.
manner and means of killing, as proved, must agree in *substance* with those laid, 157.
on indictment for murder of officer in execution of his office, proof of his authority not material; 158.
the special matter may be given in evidence on a general indictment, 158.
acquittal in foreign country may be pleaded in bar, 252.

N

NAVY OFFICE,
book of, evidence to prove sailor's death, 612.
NEGATIVE,
of issue, when to be proved, 151. 152.
NICHOLAS (Pope),
taxation by, account of, 303.
evidence of value of livings, Id.
NON-ACCESS. See tit. *Access.*
NON-AGE,
declaration of deceased parent, evidence of, 180.
NON-ASSUMPSIT,
evidence under plea of; 126.
performance—payment—release, Id.
judgment recovered, 224.
accord and satisfaction, 126.
that defendant contracted with plaintiff and *others*; 127. 162.
that plaintiff was married at the time of the promise, 127.
or was bankrupt, Id.
usury—infancy—gaming, 127. 221.
what not evidence under; 127.
statute of limitations; 127.
that others besides defendant are liable, 162.
NON EST FACTUM,
evidence under plea of, 128.
lunacy, or intoxication at the time of execution,
defendant a feme covert,
deed delivered as an escrow, &c. Id.
what not evidence under, 128.
proof of gaming—sale of office—simony, &c. 129.
payment—release—infancy—duress, 128.
plaintiff cannot show the deed lost, after pleading profert, 348.
NOTICE,
of action, proof of, by duplicate original, 342.
to quit, proof of, 343. 357. See tit. *Ejectment.*
to produce papers on trial; 336.

NOTICE, (*continued.*)
how it differs from subpœna duces tecum, 336.
when necessary, 336. 338.
party, when compellable to produce ; 336.
if a trustee ; Id.
in action by seamen for wages, 337.
proof of, 342. 343.
after proof of, contents of paper how proved, 338.
not necessary, where nature of action is sufficient notice ; 339.
as in trover for bond, Id.
or prosecution for stealing note, &c. Id.
in other criminal cases, when ; 339.
or where fraudulent possession on the other side ; 440.
whether necessary, in case the writing is in court in the adverse party's possession, 340—342.
deed produced under, to be proved by the other party, when ; 343.
when not, 345.
the whole to be read, 338.
NUL TIEL RECORD,
proof of issue on ; 289.
where the record is in the same court,
where in another court, Id.

O

OATH,
of witness, how administered, 19.
OFFICE,
books of, when evidence. See tit. *Book.*
inquisition of. See tit. *Inquisition.*
OFFICER,
competent witnesses, when ; 40.
though liable to information, Id.
proof of acting as such, evidence of being such, when, 170.
OPINION,
of witness, when evidence, 209.
general, evidence of public rights ; 183—189.
whether evidence of private rights, 189—190.
ORDER,
of judge, for producing papers, 337.
of sessions. See tit. *Sessions.*
of bastardy. See tit. *Bastardy.*
ORDINARY,
certificate of, when conclusive on legality of marriage, 244.

ORDINARY, (*continued.*)
faculty from, presumed in the case of a pew claimed as appurtenant to a messuage, 120.
OUSTER,
judgment of, on an information, 227.
OUTLAWRY,
judgment of, in treason and felony, renders incompetent; 23.
in personal action, otherwise, Id.
proof of, Id.
OWNERSHIP,
possession prima facie evidence of, 118. 119.

P

PAPAL BULL,
evidence of exemption from tithes, 319.
PARCEL,
on a question whether land is parcel of A.'s or B.'s estate, the declaration of a deceased tenant, who held under both, is evidence, 182.
PARDON,
effect of in restoring competency of witness, 27.
See tit. *Witness.*
PARISH,
inhabitant of, competent, though penalty given to the poor, when; 93.
in prosecution under highway act, when, 93.
rated, competent, on parish appeals, 93. 94.
See tit. *Inhabitant.*
register, when first commenced, 306.
proof of marriage, 306. 307.
entry of marriages how to be made, 306. 307.
copy of, to be transmitted annually to registrars of diocese, 307.
not to be contradicted by day-book, 314.
inspection of, when granted, 328.
book for copies of rates, 311.
for account of parish indentures, 312.
vestry-book, 312. 313.
examined copy of register, evidence, 321
PARLIAMENT,
acts of. See tit. *Acts.*
journal of. See tit. *Journal.*
PAROL EVIDENCE. See tit. *Evidence.*
PARSON,
entry by deceased, evidence for successor, 184. 185.
in action against, for non-residence, what sufficient evidence of his being parson, 171.
PARTICULARS (Bill of),
under judge's order—its use and effect, 146. 147.
interest on promissory note may be recovered, though not claimed in the particular, 147.
mistake in, when immaterial, 148.

PARTNER,
admission by one, evidence against another, when, 73, 266. See tit. *Admission.*
one partner may disprove the authority of another to draw a bill on the partnership for his separate debt, in action between payee and acceptor, 54.
verdict on issue, evidence of partnership, when, 232.
notice of dissolution of partnership, how given, 306.
PARTY TO SUIT,
incompetent witness. See tit. *Witness.*
admission by, evidence against him. See tit. *Admission.*
compellable to produce papers in his possession, when, 336.
PAYMENT,
evidence of, under non-assumpsit, 127.
presumptive evidence of, 113. See tit. *Presumption.*
of money into court, 142. See tit. *Money.*
on plea of payment of principal and interest, proof that a gross sum was accepted as full payment, 153.
proof of tender and refusal, evidence to support an averment of payment, when, 154.
PEDIGREE,
evidence of. See tit. *Hearsay. Herald's Books.*
bills in Chancery, not evidence of, 263.
depositions, not evidence against a stranger, 178.
special verdict, whether evidence between third parties, 134.
PENAL ACTION,
act of parliament, discharging the defendant, evidence under nil debet, 221.
PERAMBULATION,
evidence of boundary of parish, 183.
PERJURY,
proof of, by a single witness, not sufficient, 107.
conviction of, incapacitates witness, 22. 28.
party injured, competent witness, on prosecution for, 87. 88. 241.
proof of defendant's oath to answer in chancery, 296. 297.
several indictments against several,—defendant in one case competent for defendant in another, 37.
on indictment for, in answer to a bill of injunction filed by B., B. is competent, 39.
PETIT TREASON,
on indictment for, prisoner may be found guilty of murder, 156.
PLACE,
variance in proof of, 165.
POLICY OF INSURANCE,
construed with reference to usage of merchants ; 434.
not to be contradicted by usage, Id.
underwriter, competent witness, 37. 38. 100.

POLYGAMY. See tit. *Bigamy.*
POSSESSION,
prima facie evidence of property, 118. 119.
ground for presuming a grant, when, 119. 120.
POSTEA,
indorsed, not evidence of verdict, 293.
evidence that cause was tried, Id.
may be produced by associate, 293.
POWER,
deed under, how executed and attested, 358.
PRESCRIPTION,
hearsay, whether evidence of, 189. 190.
PRESENTATION,
hearsay not evidence of, 191.
PRESUMPTION AND PRESUMPTIVE EVIDENCE,
nature of, 111.
presumptive evidence of legitimacy, 112.
from fact of birth during marriage, Id.
how rebutted, 112. 113.
of payment; 113.
of payment of bond, after 20 years, 114.
how rebutted, Id. See tit. *Bond.*
release of quit-rent not presumed from non-payment, 117.
possession prima facie evidence of property, 118. 119.
grants, agreements, license, presumed from usage, 119—123.
deed of composition not presumed merely from usage, 120.
grant presumed against reversioner, from permission of tenant, when, 124.
circumstantial evidence, in criminal cases, 124.
presumption of law from presumption of fact, 125.
death presumed at the end of seven years, 152.
PRINCIPAL,
in second degree, charged as principal in first degree, not a variance, 157.
charged as such, cannot be convicted as accessary, 157.
conviction of, evidence against accessary, when, 229.
witness against accessary, on indictment for receiving stolen goods, 31.
or for taking reward to help to stolen goods, Id.
PROBATE,
of will of personal property, what, 245. 293.
conclusive of validity of will, when, 245.
may be shown to be forged, 246. 247.
of real property, not evidence of will, 246. 299.
whether evidence to prove pedigree, 299. 377.
or if the will in possession of the other party, 299. 377.
proof of will in ecclesiastical court, 298.

PROBATE, (*continued.*)
examined copy of, 299.
exemplification of probate, 299.
copy of ledger book, 300.
revocation of, how proved, 183.
PROCHEIN AMY,
not competent, in suit by infant, 46.
PROFERT,
of deed, dispensed with, when, 348.
bargain and sale pleaded with,—copy of enrolment may be shown, 355.
PROSECUTOR,
entitled to costs of prosecution, when, 87.
competent witness; 86.
though entitled to reward or penalty, 86. 92.
general rule, 86.
exception in case of forgery, 88. 89.
in case of forgery,
party injured not allowed to prove any material fact; 88. 89.
competent, if not liable on forged instrument, 89.
as cashier of Bank of England, 89.
where the banker has not debited the party, 89.
or after release, Id.
PUBLIC BOOKS. See tit. *Books.*
entry in, proved by examined copy, 320
inspection of. See tit. *Inspection.*
PUBLIC RIGHTS,
proof of, by hearsay, 183. 189.
verdict evidence of, though between other parties, 233.
PURGATION,
ancient doctrine of, 24.
its effects in restoring competency, Id.

Q

QUAKERS,
may affirm in civil cases; 20.
not in criminal cases; Id.
what criminal within the rule, Id.
in criminal cases in their own defence, 21.
QUALIFICATION,
in action on game laws, plaintiff need not disprove the several kinds of, 150.
in proceedings on conviction before magistrate, otherwise, Id.
QUARE IMPEDIT,
hearsay not evidence of presentation, 191.

R

RAPE,
on indictment for, the woman not compellable to answer as to her criminal connexion with other men; 206.

RAPE, (*continued.*)
such evidence not admissible, 141. 206.
her general bad character for want of chastity may be shown, 140.
or her previous connexion with the prisoner, Id.
the account given by her, immediately after the injury, admissible, 203.
RATE,
book for copies of, how kept, 311.
RATED INHABITANT. See tit. *Inhabitant.*
RECEIVER,
entry by, of receipt of rents, 191. 192.
proof of, 195.
RECITAL,
in deed, when evidence against the party, 356.
RECORD,
what, 218.
when complete, 291.
not to be contradicted, 218. 219.
evidence, that the verdict was entered by mistake, not admissible, 218.
not conclusive as to facts averred, when the facts are not traversable, 219.
nor, as to the *time* of the offence ; Id.
keeper of the records may speak to their condition, 219.
inspection of, 322.
admissions on, need not be proved, 141.
issue on nul tiel record, how proved, 289.
variance in proof of, 162. See tit. *Variance.*
proof of, by exemplification, 289. 290.
examined copy, 291.
office copy, 292.
copy of judgment, signed by master, not evidence, 291.
RECOVERY,
deed to make tenant to the writ of entry, when evidence of, 295.
RECTOR,
books by deceased, evidence of ecclesiastical dues, 184—187.
REGISTER,
of navy office to prove a sailor's death, 312.
of parish. See tit. *Parish.*
of ship. See tit. *Ship.*
RELEASE. See tit. *Witness.*
of interest, restores competency of witness, 97. 98.
unnecessary, 1. where the witness offers, but the other party refuses, 99.
2. where he has acquired an interest, to deprive a party of his testimony, 100.

RELEASE, (*continued.*)
3. where he has an interest inclining him to each side, 102.
REPUTATION. See tit. *Hearsay.*
RENT ROLLS,
old, when evidence, 202. 203.
RES GESTA,
hearsay, part of, when evidence, 202. 203.
See tit. *Hearsay.*
REWARD,
persons entitled to, on conviction, not incompetent, 30.
cases, in which rewards are given, 86.
ROAD. See tit. *Boundary.*
on indictment for not repairing, verdict of *not guilty* on former trial is not evidence *for* the parish ; 242.
verdict of *guilty* is *conclusive against* the parish, 224. and strong evidence against *other* parishes, 232.
on a question whether the occupier of particular land is liable to repair, an award between a former occupier and the township is not evidence, 179.
ROBBERY,
on indictment for, prisoner may be convicted of simple larceny, 156. 157.
ROLLS,
of manor court. See tit. *Manor.*
RULE OF COURT,
signed by proper officer, good evidence, 292.

S

SALE,
after proof of sale of goods to the defendant and J. S., J. S. is not competent to prove the sale to himself alone, 46.
SEAL,
of the king, or public courts of justice, need not be proved, 290.
of private or foreign courts, how proved, 290. 291. 301.
of corporations, how proved, 291.
SEALING,
of deed. See tit. *Deed.*
SEISIN,
of devisor, proved by declaration of deceased occupier, 182. 194.
SENTENCE,
of courts. See tit. *Judgment.*
SERVANT,
incompetent to disprove his own negligence in action against his master, 46. 96.
competent, in action by his master, to prove delivery of goods, &c. 95.
not to prove acts done by him out of the course of his duty, when, 95. 96.

SESSIONS,
order of, *confirming* order of removal, conclusive as to all parishes, 231.
discharging, conclusive only that the settlement was not with the respondents, 224.
SETTLEMENT,
by purchase of estate,
parol evidence may be admitted to show that the purchaser agreed to pay more than 30l., though the deed expresses less; 426.
or that less was paid than is expressed, 428.
SHERIFF,
officer, indemnifying him, not competent witness for him, 46.
admission of, as to custody of debtor in execution, evidence against sheriff, when, 76. See tit. *Agent.*
return of, on the writ, evidence of the facts there stated, 294.
inquisition by, 283.
act relative to sheriff's bonds, 220.
SHIP,
property in, proved by possession as owner, 308. 309. 311.
log-book of, evidence of time of convoy's sailing, 312.
register of, evidence of want of title, when, 308. 309.
not evidence of property, unless recognised, 309. 311.
conclusive, that persons not named therein are not owners, 308.
articles, to be produced by defendant, in action for wages, 337.
SHOP-BOOK,
entry by deceased shopman, when evidence; 195—199.
by the master, not evidence; 199.
may be used, as a memorandum. Id.
SIGNING,
of deed, or will. See tit. *Deed. Will.*
SLANDER,
proof of the *substance* of the words, sufficient, 155.
against person in professional capacity, when necessary to prove his qualification, 172. 173.
other actionable words, when evidence, 134. 135.
SOLDIER,
examination of, under mutiny act, when evidence, 285. 286. See tit. *Examination.*
SOLICITOR,
not allowed to give evidence of professional communications of his client, 102—106.
See tit. *Counsel.*

SON ASSAULT,
See tit. *Trespass.*
SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE,
on bill for, *defendant* may show that the agreement has been discharged; 446. 447.
or that it is different from that intended; 449—451.
or that they afterwards agreed to a variation, when, 450.
plaintiff may show the omission of a term, by fraud; 451. &c.
whether he may show it by mistake or surprise; 452—455.
cannot vary agreement by parol evidence, so to have it executed in its varied form, 456.
part performance of agreement for land, what, 457. 458.
STAMP,
contents of unstamped paper cannot be shown, if stamp necessary, 386.
other proof of the transaction, besides the writing, when admissible, 386.
fact of payment may be shown, if receipt unstamped; Id.
unstamped receipt, used as a memorandum; Id.
agreement admitted on the record, need not be stamped, 387.
after payment of money into court, want of stamp no objection, 405.
in action on note unstamped, when plaintiff may recover on other counts, 386.
foreign instrument, to be stamped according to the law of the country; 387.
bill incipient here, completed out of the kingdom, 387. 388.
of proper value and denomination, 388.
receipt stamp not sufficient for promissory note, Id.
articles of agreement under seal to be stamped as a deed, 388.
agreement for house, and also for goods in it, to be stamped as a lease, 388.
value being greater than the true stamp is not material, if the denomination right; 389.
where the denomination is different but of equal or greater value, commissioners may re-stamp, when, Id.
several stamps on one instrument, when necessary, 389—393.

STAMP, (*continued.*)
new stamp, on alteration of instrument, when necessary, 393—396.
on bill of exchange or promissory note, Id.
on policy of insurance, 394.
if the alteration is to correct a mistake, new stamp unnecessary, 396—398.
unstamped instrument, evidence for collateral purposes, when; 398—403.
in action for penalty for illegal insurance, 398.
for bribery at election, 399.
unstamped paper, as a memorandum, 399.
as secondary evidence, 399.
unstamped agreement may be inspected, to ascertain the time with reference to a subsequent agreement, 399.
or to see the nature of the hand-writing, 400.
unstamped instrument may be recovered in trover, 400.
unstamped instrument, evidence in prosecution for forgery, 400.
draft, unstamped, not admissible on indictment for secreting a letter containing, &c., under stat. 7 G. 3. c. 50. s. 1. 401.
policy of insurance unstamped not evidence on indictment for burning, &c. with intent, &c. 402.
lost instrument presumed to be stamped, when, 403.
want of, when to be repaired, and how, 404.
agreements, what, to be stamped; 405.
fresh item added, 405.
receipt, properly stamped as such, admissible, though it contain an agreement, 405.
cognovit need not be stamped; 406.
agreements exempted from stamp, what; 406.
1. memorandum of assurance, Id.
2. memorandum for granting lease, Id.
agreement, when a present demise, Id.
3. memorandum for hire of labourer, &c. 407.
agreement for assignment of apprentice not exempted, Id.

STAMP, (*continued.*)
4. memorandum for or relating to sale of goods, 407.
agreement to take a share of goods, &c. 407.
to indemnify on resale, &c. Id.
guarantee for payment of goods, 408.
agreement for making of goods, Id.
for sale of crops, 408. 409.
5. memorandum between master and mariners of ship, &c. 409.
6. letters containing argeement respecting merchandise between merchants, 409.
STATUTE OF FRAUDS, (29 C. 2. c. 3.)
fourth section, "that no action shall be brought," &c. 440. 445.
memorandum of *agreement* must specify the consideration, 440.
party may recover upon agreement under this section, though he has not signed it, 440.
in the memorandum of promise to pay the debt of another, the precise amount of the debt need not be stated, 441.
fifth section, as to requisites of wills, 374.
seventeenth section, as to contracts for sales of goods; 441. 445.
the memorandum of *bargain* need not specify the consideration, 441.
twenty-second section, as to repeal of wills, 423. 424.
STEWARD,
entry by deceased, as to receipt of money, 191. 192.
SUBPŒNA,
ad testificandum, writ of, (see tit. *Witness.*)
what, 2. 3.
how many may be put in one writ, Id.
duces tecum, 11. 335.
SUBSTANCE,
of issue, to be proved. See tit. *Evidence.*
SURVEY, see tit. *Terrier.*
of benefices by Pope Nicholas; 303.
history of,
evidence of what; Id.
valor beneficiorum in reign of H. 8. 304.
in time of the commonwealth, 304.
their great authority in questions of tithes, 304. 305.

SURVEY, (*continued.*)
ancient surveys, evidence, without proof of commission, when, 304.
of manor or estate, when evidence, 187. 188.

T

TAXATION,
of Pope Nicholas, 303.
TERRIER,
of manor, evidence of boundary or tenure, 316.
ecclesiastical, what, 316.
evidence of church possessions; Id.
for parson, when; 318.
against him, when, Id.
from what repository; 316.
by whom to be signed; 318.
not evidence, unless possession satisfactorily explained, 317.
TIME,
variance in proof of, 164.
TITHES,
evidence of parson's title by admission, 172.
entry by deceased rector, evidence, 184—187.
modus on one particular farm, not evidence of modus on another, 132.
unless some connexion shown.
composition real not to be presumed from usage, 119.
in action for, plea that plaintiff had not read the 39 articles, to be proved by defendant, 151.
answer of occupier of land, in a tithe cause, evidence against a succeeding occupier, 266.
See tit. *Prescription. Terrier. Modus. Survey.*
TOLLS,
hearsay evidence of right of, 189.
verdict, evidence of, though between other parties, 233.
TRADESMAN,
books of, evidence of delivery of goods, when, 195—199.
TREASON,
confession, evidence in case of, 84.
See tit. *Confession.*
conspiracy to seize the king's person, an overt-act of conspiring his death, 125.
so, conspiring with foreigners to effect an invasion; Id.
no overt-act of *distinct* treason to be proved, 136.
confession, evidence in case of, 84. See tit. *Confession.*
proof of overt act by two witnesses; 108. 109.
otherwise, where the overt-act laid is assassination, &c., 109.
or in treason for impairing the coin, 109.
when *other* acts of the prisoner are evidence against him, as showing his intention, his *contemporaneous* acts are also evidence for him, 138.

TRESPASS,
for assault, (see tit. *Assault.*)
first assault by plaintiff cannot be shown under general issue, except in mitigation, 129.
any number of trespasses, within the days mentioned in the declaration, may be proved ; 134.
or one trespass beyond the remotest day, Id.
co-trespasser, competent witness, 32.
for goods,
what property sufficient, 118.
by agister of cattle,
by stage coachman, Id.
for mesne profits,
judgment in ejectment conclusive as to right of possession, 224.
quare clausum fregit,
title of defendant may be shown, under general issue ; 129.
license from plaintiff, cannot, Id.
nor defect of fences,
nor easement.
proof of entry for distress admissible, under general issue, 129.
on plea of soil and freehold, a verdict on the same plea in a former action conclusive, 224. 225.
TRUSTEE,
not incompetent witness, though liable to action, 40.

U

UNDERWRITER,
competent for another underwriter in an action on policy of insurance, 37.
USAGE,
evidence of agreement, 119.
to explain ancient charters, 419.
or private deeds, when, 421.
mercantile contracts, 434—436.
See tit. *Custom. Easement. Presumption.*
USE AND OCCUPATION,
in action for, unnecessary to describe where the premises lie ; 166.
if described as lying in a particular parish, they ought to be so proved, Id.
USURY,
in action for penalties, the borrower competent, 39.
evidence of *other* usurious contracts not admissible, 210.
may be given in evidence, under non assumpsit, 127. 221.
not in debt on bond, unless pleaded, 220.
UTTERING,
indictment for uttering forged notes or bad money, 10.

UTTERING, (*continued.*)
proof of prisoner having uttered others similar, as evidence of his knowledge, &c. 137.

V

VARIANCE,
in proof of contract, 160. 161.
of deed, 162.
of record, 162.
when the record only *described*, Id.
when its *substance* set out, 163.
in proof of time, 164.
of place, 165. 166.
examples of,
demise pleaded to hold *from* a certain day—demise proved *on* that day, 155.
in replevin—*part* only of the cattle proved to be levant and couchant, 156.
on issue whether A. and B. were churchwardens—proof that only one was, Id.
averment, that plaintiff was constable in parish of P., and proof that he was sworn in for a liberty, of which P. was only part, 156.
prisoner, charged as principal in 1st degree—proved to be principal in 2d degree, not a variance, 157.
in assumpsit, it is no variance, that others besides the defendant are parties to the contract, 161. 162.
but if others ought *to join* in the action, the defendant may take advantage of it, on non assumpsit, 162.
See other examples under tit. *Murder. Principal. Evidence.*

VENUE,
when the place is only for venue, a variance in the place proved, not material, 166.
on indictment for felony *at a certain place*, if there is *no such place* in the county, the indictment void, 166.

VERDICT, see tit. *Judgment.*
admissible in evidence, when, 222—237.
considered with reference to *the parties*, 222—223.
conclusive between the same parties, when, 223. 224. 226.
evidence between *privies* to the first suit; 226.
verdict by ancestor evidence for heir, 226.
verdict by one remainder-man, evidence for another, 227.
for or against lessee, evidence for or against reversioner. 227.
not evidence *for one of the parties against* a stranger 228.

VERDICT, (*continued.*)
verdict against another person who justified as servant of, &c., evidence on the question of right, 228.
conviction of principal evidence against accessary, 229.
not evidence *for a stranger* against a party, 230.
judgment in rem in the Exchequer, 231.
judgment of quarter sessions, Id.
conviction against parish for non-repair of a road, Id.
verdict on issue to try a partnership. 232.
on question of custom, tolls, &c. a verdict is evidence between third persons, 233.
special verdict, stating a pedigree, whether evidence between third persons, 234.
verdict, in action for negligence of servant, is evidence in action by the master against the servant, 228.
considered, with reference to the *subject-matter*, 234—237.
verdict in trover, a bar to an action for money had and received, 235.
where plaintiff in first action failed from defect of pleading; 235.
or gave no evidence of the demand, Id.
verdict final only, as to its proper purpose, 236.
verdict in action for a nuisance not conclusive as to the right; 236.
in ejectment, not conclusive as to title, in another ejectment, Id.
verdict in criminal case, whether evidence in civil, 237—241.
evidence, that the verdict was entered by mistake, not admissible, 218.
where *special* verdict may be found, though a general one cannot, 155.
in debt in award, and "*no such award*" pleaded, the jury cannot find the award void by matter dehors, &c. 141.
proof of; 293.
postea indorsed, not evidence of, 293.
evidence, that cause was tried, Id.
judgment to be shown, entered up, Id.
on issue out of Chancery, decree to be shown, Id.

VESTRY-BOOK. See tit. *Parish.*
VICARAGE,
endowment of, when presumed, 119.
VICE-CONSUL,
certificate of, abroad, 288. See tit. *Certificate.*
VIDELICET,
effect of, in pleading, 163.
VOIRE DIRE, see tit. *Witness.*
objection, arising on, may be removed on the same, 96.

W

WAGER,
in action for, one who lays a similar wager is competent, 99.
on event of prosecution, will not make witness incompetent, 102.
WAGES,
in action for by seamen, the contract to be produced by the defendant, 337.
WAR,
articles of, how proved, 305.
WARRANTY,
action *in tort* for breach of warranty of goods—plaintiff need not prove that defendant *knew* the goods to be in an unfit state, though so averred, 159.
the substantive parts of the warranty to be stated and proved, 161.
WAY, see tit. *Road.*
public right of,
hearsay, evidence of; 189.
verdict, evidence, though between other parties, 233.
private right of,
hearsay, whether evidence of, 190.
usage, evidence of, 120.
extent of right limited by the usage, 122. 123.
use of way for carriages, evidence of a grant of drift-way, 123.
WAY-GOING CROP,
by custom, though not expressed in lease, 429.
WIFE, see tit. *Husband and Wife.*
WILL,
of personal property,
proof of, in ecclesiastical court; 245. 293.
probate, evidence of, 245. See tit. *Probate.*
ledger book of ecclesiastical court, 300.
copy of, 300.
of real property,
requisites of, by stat. of frauds, 374.
of copyhold, requires neither attestation, nor siguing, Id.
exemplification of, not evidence; 377.

WILL, (*continued.*)
probate of, whether evidence to prove a pedigree; Id.
as secondary evidence, 378.
proof of, by subscribing witness; 378.
single witness, sufficient, at law; Id.
rule in chancery, Id.
"credible witnesses," who, within 5th section of stat. of frauds; 375.
convicted of infamous crime, not good witness, 376.
interested under will; Id.
whether competent, after release; Id.
devise to witness, void, 376.
creditor may attest, though will charged with debt, 376.
subscribing witness, what to prove; 378. 383.
may prove the will forged, 32.
signing; 379.
in any part of will,
of part, intending to sign the whole,
by mark,
stamped name,
by seal, insufficient: 379. 380.
testator blind, 380.
attestation; 380.
need not express that they subscribed in the testator's presence 381.
witnesses need not see testator sign; 380. 381.
if he acknowledges his will, sufficient, 391.
need not all attest at the same time; Id.
nor attest every page; 382.
whole will to be present, Id.
by mark, 381.
in presence of testator, 382.
if he might see the attestation, sufficient, Id.
execution, how proved, when subscribing witness dead, insane, or abroad; 383. 384. 385.
when hand-writing cannot be proved, 385.
will 30 years old, whether to be proved, 385.
if witnesses deny the due execution, they may be contradicted, 384.
will impeached for fraud—evidence is admissible of what testator said at the time; 428.
if impeached by witness, who imputes fraud to the other subscribing witnesses deceased, evidence of their good character admissible, 385.
ambiguity in will, when explained by parol evidence; 410. 411. 417.

WILL, (*continued.*)
See tit. *Ambiguity*, and *Evidence.*
mistake in will, as to devisee's name, or description of property, when explained, 411. 412. 413.
trust in will raised by parol evidence, when, 460.
WITNESS,
attesting to deed; see tit. *Deed.*
to will. See tit. *Will.*
deceased, testimony of, when evidence, 199.
depositions of. See tit. *Deposition.*
attendance of, to give evidence, at trial, 2.
mode of procuring attendance,
in civil cases, 2.
subpœna ad testificandum,
how many may be put in one writ; 4
service of, 4.
duces tecum, 11.
before commissioners of bankrupt, 6.
of enclosure, 7.
in criminal cases; 7.
subpœna ad testificandum,
service of in different parts of the kingdom, 8.
recognisance, 7.
habeas corpus ad testificandum; 9. 10.
when the writ lies,
how sued out and served; 9. 10.
for prisoners to come before commissioners, 10.
expenses of witness in civil cases; 3.
in criminal cases, 8. 9.
privilege of, from arrest, on trial, 5. 6.
before arbitrator, 6.
before commissioners of bankrupt; Id.
in going and returning, 5.
proceedings against, for non-attendance; 4. 5.
attachment,
action on case for damages,
or on stat. 5 Eliz. Id.
incompetency of; from
1. Want of understanding, 13.
insane, idiots, lunatics;
deaf and dumb, how to give evidence:
children, when competent, 14. 15.
their declarations, not upon oath, not evidence, 15.
2. Want of religious principle, 16.
what he ought to believe;
atheists, infidels, incompetent, 17.
excommunication, not a ground of objection, 18.

WITNESS, (*continued.*)
oath, how administered, 19.
Quakers may affirm, when, 20.
See tit. *Quakers.*
3. Infamy of character; 22.
what offences incapacitate, 22. 23.
proof of, by record of judgment, 24.
competency, how restored, 24.
purgation, ancient doctrine of, 17.
benefit of clergy, and burning in hand, 25. 26.
who entitled to clergy without the burning; 25. 26.
proof of, 26.
pardon, 27.
under great seal,
by act of parliament, Id.
if conditional, performance to be shown, 27. 28.
when disability part of sentence, Id.
warrant under privy seal, insufficient, Id.
accomplices, competent, 28.
See tit. *Accomplice.*
witness giving evidence to avoid his own instrument, not incompetent, 33.
4. Interest renders witnesses incompetent, 34.
reason of the rule, 34.
objection when to be made, 96.
of the nature of the interest which disqualifies, 36—56.
interest, *in the question,*—in the *event of the suit*, 36.
wishes, or bias on the subject, expectation of benefit, &c. 36—38.
several actions of assault, or several indictments for perjury,—defendant in one competent for a defendant in another, 37.
one underwriter competent for another, Id.
on indictment for perjury in answer to a bill filed by B., B. is competent, 39.
borrower of money competent to prove usury, 39.
that the event may make it more easy to recover in his own case, or that the verdict may be heard of by the jury,—no ground of incompetency, 38. 39.

WITNESS, (*continued.*)
liability to action or information, not sufficient objection ; 40.
persons in office,
executor de son tort,
trustees, agents, 40.
witness thinking himself interested, 41—43.
honorary engagement to pay costs, 42.
1. Where a verdict may be evidence for or against a witness, he is incompetent ; 43. 44.
as on question, of customary right of common, 44.
of way-going crop, 44.
of liability to repair fences contiguous to a common, 44.
of parochial modus, 45.
of common by vincinage ; 45.
otherwise when the right is merely prescriptive, 45.
defendant's bail not competent, 46.
sheriffs officer giving security, &c. Id.
prochein amy or guardian, Id.
servant incompetent to disprove his own negligence in action against his master, 46.
after proof of sale of goods to defendant and J. S. as partners, J. S. is not competent to prove the sale to himself alone, 46.
in action by indorsee against acceptor, the drawer of an accommodation bill is not competent witness for defendant to prove, that plaintiff took it for usurious consideration, 46. 48. 49.
in ejectment, the tenant in possession is not competent for defendant under whom he holds, 48.
one who is to have a lease of the lands, if recovered, not competent for plaintiff, 48.
2. Where witness directly gains or loses by the event, he is incompetent, 49. 50.
however small the gain or loss, 52. 53.
witness not competent, who has to pay, or be paid, on the event, 48. 49.
devisee taking under the same will, 51.
bankrupt not competent to increase the fund, 51. See tit. *Bankrupt.*

WITNESS, (*continued.*)
creditor of bankrupt not competent to increase the fund, 51.
See tit. *Bankrupt.*
witness discharging himself of a debt, 52.
in ejectment, witness not competent for defendant to prove himself the real *tenant*, and the defendant his bailiff, 52.
where the witness is indifferent to either party, having an interest towards each, he is competent, 53.
as the person who received money, in assumpsit for money had and received, 53.
in question on priority of demise, lessor competent, when, 53. 54.
bill of exchange drawn as in partnership firm,—either party competent to show want of authority in the drawer, in action by payee against acceptor, 54.
where the witness has a remedy against either party, the circumstance of its being more easy to enforce it in the one case than in the other will not make him incompetent, 55. 56.
interested witness cannot give *any kind* of evidence, that is material for enabling the party to recover, on the side on which the interest lies, 56.
party to suit, incompetent, 57.
though mere trustee, Id.
corporate body, liable to costs individually, incompetent, though indemnified, Id.
but competent, if liable only in corporate capacity; Id.
exception, in action on stat. of Winton. 57. See tit. *Hundred.*
party, not compellable to give evidence, 60.
rated inhabitant not compellable, 60.
may give evidence against joint suitor, 60. 61.
defendant, when and how to be made witness, 61.
See tit. *Defendant.*
husband and wife of party to the suit incompetent, 63. See tit. *Husband and Wife.*
admissions of party, evidence against him, 71.
See tit. *Admission.*
party injured, competent in criminal prosecutions, 86.
See tit. *Prosecutor.*
exceptions to general rule, on the subject of interest, 91—96.
informers, competent, when, 92.
inhabitants of county, parish, &c. when, 92.
See tit. *Inhabitant.*

WITNESS, (*continued.*)
surveyor of parish, in prosecution under highway act, 93.
persons entitled to reward on conviction, 94.
agents, servants, factors, when competent, 94. 95.
competency of interested witness, restored, how, 96.
by release, payment, &c. 97.
of bankrupt, 98.
of member of corporation, 98.
by resignation or disfranchisement, Id.
release, when unnecessary ; 99.
See tit. *Release.*
objection to competency, when to be made, 96.
examination of,
on interrogatories, 10.
of prisoner of war, 10.
witness resident abroad, 10.
in India, 11.
going abroad, 10.
by consent, 13.
objection to competency, when regularly taken, 96. 205.
leading question, allowed in cross-examination, 205.
when, in examination in chief, Id.
privileged from answering, when, 206.
to expose himself to criminal charge or penalty, 206.
to declare his own infamy ; 206—208.
not privileged, if his answer would only subject him to a civil action, 208.
or charge him with a debt, Id.
number of witnesses, to prove a fact ; 107.
in trial for perjury, 107.
in treason, 108. See tit. *Treason.*
in courts of equity, 110.
in ecclesiastical courts, 110.
memorandum to assist memory, 199. 209.
opinion of, when evidence, 209.
cross-examination of, rule as to ; 210.
not to collateral, irrelevant facts, 210.
witness, called and sworn, but not examined, may be cross-examined, 211.
whether, after cross-examination, a party may recall the witness to prove his case, and put leading questions, 211.
books, called for and produced, but not used, are not therefore evidence *for* the party who produces, 212.
but are evidence for him, if inspected, though not used, Id.

WITNESS, (*continued.*)
credit of, how impeached ; 212.
by witness to his general character, 212.
by disproving the facts stated by him, Id.
by proof of contradictory statements ; Id.
depositions signed by witness, evidence to contradict, 212.
conviction, purporting to set out his deposition, not evidence, 212. 213.
party calling, cannot discredit him by evidence of his general bad character ; 110.
may disprove facts, Id.
WORDS,
action for. See tit. *Libel. Slander.*
WRIT,
return of sheriff, upon evidence of the fact, 294.
suing out, how proved ; 293.
when only inducement,
when the gist of the action, Id.
fieri facias, without proof of judgment, evidence, when, Id.
of habeas corpus ad testificandum, } See tit. *Witness.*
of subpœna ad testificandum, duces tecum. } See tit. *Witness.*
WRITINGS,
ancient, when evidence ; 315.
proper custody of, to be shown, 317. 349.
public, not judicial ; 302—320.
inspection of ; see tit. *Inspection.*
proof of entry in, 321.
private ; 335. See tit. *Deed.*
copy of, when evidence ; 338. 346.
parol evidence of ; Id.
duplicate original, 342. 343.
process for compelling production ; 11. 335.
party, when excused from producing, 336.
notice to produce, 336. See tit. *Notice.*
rule of court to produce, to get the writing stamped, 346. *n.*
rule for inspecting and taking copy, Id.
judge's order for producing, in action on policy. 337.
proof of written instrument, 356. 357. &c.
hand-writing how proved, 364. See tit. *Hand-writing.*

THE END.

THE

THEORY

OF

PRESUMPTIVE PROOF.

THE

THEORY

OF

PRESUMPTIVE PROOF;

OR,

AN INQUIRY

INTO THE NATURE

OF CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE:

INCLUDING

AN EXAMINATION OF THE EVIDENCE

ON THE

TRIAL OF CAPTAIN DONNELLAN.

NEW-YORK:

PUBLISHED BY GOULD, BANKS, AND GOULD, AND BY W. GOULD & CO.,

ALBANY.

G. F. HOPKINS, PRINTER.

1816.

PREFACE.

THE learned and elegant Writer on the Principles of Penal Law, suggested the idea of the following Essay. "The general Principles of Evidence," he observes, "are a field still open to investigation: "for the considerations of some very ingenious "writers on this subject, have been too much influ- "enced by their acquiescence in practical autho- "rity: and we are furnished, rather with useful "and sensible histories of what the Law of Evi- "dence actually is, than with any free and specula- "tive disquisition of what it ought to be."*

The nature of circumstantial evidence, has never, so far as I know, formed the subject of any disquisition in the English language. A contradictory argument has always appeared to me to be grounded on the multiplicity of circumstances produced against a prisoner: the number of circumstances are said to be a proof of guilt; and, on the other hand, they are said to favour the escape of the innocent. Yet few if any instances occur, of a prisoner having been acquitted who was surrounded by circumstances unfavourable to innocence: too many instances, however, may be produced of innocent persons having fallen victims to that species of proof. As every principle, in reference to practical good, must be estimated by its effects, I have conceived the Cases adduced in the Appendix, are an

* Principles of Penal Law, p. 164.

illustration superior to all general argument or abstract theory; and have not accordingly, extended this Essay to that length, which the importance of the subject might have warranted.

Several examinations of the case of captain Donnellan, appear to have been published recently after his trial. After a long search, I was not so fortunate as to obtain more than one of these, by a Barrister of the Inner Temple, and which is printed for Hooper in 1781. The only material assistance which I have derived from it, consists in the Cases which were annexed.

Some of these cases are here omitted, as not appearing sufficiently illustrative. The case of *Joan Perry* and her two sons, *John* and *Richard Perry*, for the supposed murder of William Harrison, gent. being to be found in the Appendix to the tenth volume of the State Trials, are not included.—The cases of *Calas* and *Serven* being inserted in some of the editions of Beccaria's Treatises on Crimes are also omitted.

The case of Le Brun, who was executed at Paris, in 1689, for the supposed murder of Lady Mazel, affords a curious illustration of the delicacy of presumptive proof;—"From the whole story, "the reader will perceive how fallible human rea-"son is, when applied to circumstances; and the "humane will agree, that, in such cases, even im-"probabilities ought to be admitted, rather than a "man should be condemned who may possibly be "innocent." (Vide Gentleman's Magazine, August and September, 1763.)

The case of the Sieur d'Anglade, who was con-

demned by the Parliament of Paris, in 1688, for a robbery of the Count Montgomery, although singularly curious and interesting, could not be inserted, without swelling this little publication to an inconvenient bulk.

The subject of the present Essay is limited to the consideration of circumstantial Evidence, which, from its very nature, can never be made liable to positive rules. The case is otherwise, as to the more general principles of evidence; which, as they may be distinctly ascertained, ought always to be scrupulously observed. In the Courts of Westminster Hall, a long train of decisions has produced a track, which the Judges hold themselves bound to follow. But every right is not judged of in Westminster Hall. How many rights and claims are determined by commissioners, boards, and committees, vested, for that purpose, with special powers, by the legislature! We do not presume to question the propriety of such particular authorities being occasionally granted; but we must take the liberty to lament, that all boards and commissioners, of this sort, are not bound by positive enactment of the legislature, (for bound on principles of justice and reason they certainly are,) to conduct their examinations in conformity to the established rules of evidence; as known to the common law, and practice of the ordinary courts of justice. The committees of the House of Commons, in determining controverted elections, appear anxious to regulate their proceedings by the common rules of evidence. But we have understood that commissioners conceive

themselves, as sometimes at liberty to proceed by a more lax, and at other times bound by a stricter rule, than what the courts of law observe.

What is this, but setting up private judgment in opposition to public law?

The principle of our constitution is clearly this: whenever any commission, or public body, under whatever description it may be constituted, acts as supplemental of the common law, it shall regulate its proceedings, if not by all the forms, at least by the general grounds and rules of that law. Any departure from those rules will always hazard an erroneous decision.

A claim can only be judged of, by the proof admitted in support of it. When you infringe upon the legal evidence of my right, you hazard my right itself. He who perverts the means, prevents the end. No man is entitled to any property, but in so far as he can make proof of his claim.

The evidence therefore, or means of proof, is inseparable from the claim itself; the existence of the one, is essential to that of the other; they must both stand or fall together; and, accordingly, any attempt to abridge or alter the rules of testimony, is a violation of the law, and a denial of justice.

We believe that these innovations have, in general, been dictated, they are at least always excused, by a principle of equity. But the evidence in courts of equity, is the same as in courts of common law. The proof of the fact itself, is a separate question from the equity that shall proportion the claim. In fine, the law of evidence is the birth-

right of every British subject; his property, his character, his life, are all dependent on this; it is, therefore, not only a primitive right itself, but the palladium of every other; and which it is sacrilege to violate.

THE

THEORY

OF

PRESUMPTIVE PROOF,

&c. &c.

THERE is no branch of legal knowledge which is of more general utility, than that which regards the rules of evidence. The first point in every trial, is to establish the facts of the case; for he who fails in his proof, fails in every thing. Although the jurists hold the law to be always fixed and certain, yet the discovery of the fact, they say, may deceive the most skilful. No work has as yet appeared in the English language on the theory of evidence; and the nature of circumstantial evidence has been still less inquired into. The object of the present Essay is to inquire into some of the more general principles of legal proof, and particularly into that species of proof which is founded on presumptions, and is known to the English lawyer by the name of circumstantial evidence.

*Evidence and proof are often confounded, as implying the same idea; but they differ, as cause and effect. Proof is the legal credence which the law gives to any statement, by witnesses or writings; evidence is the legal process by which that proof is made. Hence, we say, that the law admits of no proof but such as is made agreeably to its own principles. *12

The principles of evidence are founded on our observations on human conduct, on common life, and living manners: they are not just because they are rules of law;

but they are rules of law because they are just and reasonable.

It has been found, from common observation, that certain circumstances warrant certain presumptions. Thus, that a mother shall feel an affection for her child,—that a man shall be influenced by his interest,—that youth shall be susceptible of the passion of love,—are laws of our general nature, and grounds of evidence in every country. Of the two women who contended for their right to the child, she was declared to be the mother who would not consent to its being divided betwixt them. When *Lothario* tells us that he stole alone, at night, into the chamber of his mistress, "hot with the Tuscan grape, and high in blood!" *Cætera quis nescit?*

* 13 *As the principles of evidence are founded on the observations of what we have seen, or believed to have been passing in real life, they will accordingly be suited to the state of the society in which we live, or to the manners and habits of the times. The following passage, in the excellent memoirs of *Philip de Comines*, I believe to be perfectly true, because it is confirmed by other accounts of the general state of manners at the period when he wrote.

Lewis XI. distributed, he asserts, for corrupt purposes, sixteen thousand crowns among the King of England's officers that were about his person, particularly to the chancellor, the master of the rolls, the lord chancellor, &c. &c.†

The truth of this narrative has never been called in question, because it is given by an historian of great gravity and character, and is illustrated by the manners of the age; yet although the author says that his design in writing of these transactions, is to show the method and conduct of all human affairs, by the reading of which such persons as are employed in the negotiation of great matters, may be instructed how to manage their administrations, we
* 14 should find *it difficult to give credence to such facts, if related of any modern lord high chancellor or officer of

† V. 2. p. 7.

state of the court of England. Thus, the same presumptive evidence that is good as to the court of Edward IV. and the æra of 1477, is altogether extravagant if applied to the court of George III. and the beginning of the 19th century.

The oration of Cicero for Cluentius, exhibits evidence of judicial corruption which can only be credited from our general knowledge of Roman manners at the æra of the facts which he describes.

The King of Siam gave credence to every thing which a European ambassador told him, as to the circumstances and condition of Europe, until he came to acquaint him, that the rivers and sea were occasionally made so hard, by the cold, that people could walk on them; but this story he totally disbelieved and rejected, as entirely repugnant to every thing which he had either seen or heard; and the ground of his disbelief was perfectly rational.

A similar principle sways our belief in respect to the acts of individuals, as arising in the society and period in which we live. We always refer the credibility of the case to what has fallen within our own observation and experience *of men and things. We readily give credence to acts of * 15
common occurrence, and are slow in yielding our assent to the existence of new and unlooked for events. When a wretch, at no distant period, in affluent circumstances, was accused of having stolen some sheets of paper in a shop, the judges admitted him to bail against evidence, because the charge was altogether unlikely in one of his condition in life. From these instances, we may safely infer that the principles for our believing or disbelieving any fact, are rather governed by the manners and habits of society, than by any positive rule. The writers on the general law of evidence, such as Mascardus and Menochius, have accordingly declared that all proof is arbitrary, and depends on the feelings of the judges.

There are two species of presumptive proof: the first is the presumption of the law, and the second the presumption of the judge, juryman, or tryer.

The presumption of the law is that conclusion which the law attaches to a certain species of guilt. Thus, that he who has deliberately and wilfully killed another, has done so from malice, is a presumption of the law. But how far
*16 he who has been found with the sword in his hand by *the body of the man just killed, did or did not give the mortal stroke, is a presumption to be made by the jury, and is not determined nor determinable by any positive rule of law.

The presumption of the law, Montesquieu observes, is preferable to that of man. The French law considers every act of a merchant, during the ten days preceding his bankruptcy, as fraudulent; this is the presumption of the law.

The modern French code has wisely decreed, that when the law, on account of circumstances, shall have deemed certain acts fraudulent, proof shall not be admitted that they were done without fraud. And in our own, as in every other system of legislation, a variety of qualities are presumed as to different persons and things, against which no proof shall be allowed. Certainty is the great object of legislation, and nothing could be established but by the determination of some thing as already fixed.

All proof is in reference to some fact already known and admitted,—what is doubtful must be proved in reference to what is true.

The following rules, by Quintilian, proceed upon this principle, but they are, perhaps, rather curious than use-
*17 ful:—*One thing is, because *another is not:* it is day, therefore it is not night. *One thing is, therefore another is:* the sun is risen, therefore it is day. *One thing is not, therefore another is:* it is not night, therefore it is day. *One thing is not, therefore another is not:* he is not rational, therefore not a man.

Evidence is divided into positive and presumptive. Positive evidence is where the witness swears distinctly to the commission of the act or crime which forms the subject of the trial. Presumptive evidence is that conclusion

which the jury draw for themselves, from circumstances or minor facts, as sworn to by the witnesses.

Presumptions are consequences drawn from a fact that is known to serve for the discovery of the truth of a fact that is uncertain, and which one seeks to prove. But no presumption can be made but on a fact already known and ascertained. Thus, if the stains of blood on the coat of one tried for murder, are to be presumed as evidence of his guilt, the fact of the stains being occasioned by blood must be first distinctly ascertained; the one presumption cannot be made to aid the other.

The stains are not to be presumed from blood because he is presumed to have been the murderer; nor, on the other hand, is he to be believed *the murderer, because the * 18
stains are believed to be from blood; for this is reasoning in a circle, and returning back to the point from whence the argument commenced. In laws, the arguments should be drawn from one reality to another, and not from reality to figure, or from figure to reality.

Whilst dwelling on the general head of proof, it may be proper to inquire in what does proof naturally consist. Is one witness, according to the principles of natural reason, sufficient to give legal credence, or are two witnesses necessary?

The Roman or civil law has required two witnesses to each separate fact.

But this principle did not, perhaps, arise from the dictates of legal prudence, but was borrowed from a text in the Scripture: "In the mouth of two or three shall the truth be established." The text was meant merely to carry reference to certain circumstances incident to the Christian religion. But the principles of religion are happily founded on higher evidence than is necessary to guide men in the business of common life.

The incidents of commerce, and the daily intercourse of mankind, require only that moral certainty which we are warranted, from general observations, to confide in. It were superfluous to show how difficult it must be, nay, how

impossible, *often to prove a crime by two witnesses. The absurdity and inconveniency of the rule has been attended with that effect which will always attend an inconvenient law; a variety of shifts have been invented to evade it. One witness is held sufficient to a fact of a general nature, and half proofs have been established.

If the rules of evidence are founded on the principles of human nature; if, like other rules, their fitness is to be judged of, by their practical utility; it must be admitted, that a proof by one witness, or by circumstances, in certain cases, is good and reasonable.

It is true, that, by the English law of high treason, that is by the 25th of Edward the Third, two witnesses are required to convict a prisoner of the charge: that is to say, one witness to one fact, and another to a different fact, of the same species of treason, shall be held to be two witnesses within the meaning of the statute. But this law was passed for the security of the subject, and to guard against the overbearing influence of the crown in state prosecutions; and it is no doubt in reference to crimes against the state, that Montesquieu has made the following observation:—"Those laws which condemn a man to death, on the deposition of a single witness, are fatal to liberty. In
*20 right reason there *should be two; because a witness who affirms, and the accused who denies, make an equal balance, and a third must incline the scale†."—Besides, the observation is made by a writer speaking in reference no doubt to the *civil law*, where there is no jury to estimate the weight due to the evidence. In the present Essay, it is not meant to inquire, what crimes should be liable to the punishment of death, and what not; it is only proposed to inquire, what degree of proof is sufficient to satisfy the mind of the commission of the act. The principle in law is clear, that the guilt is neither increased nor diminished by the fulness or defect of the proof.

When, it will be asked, shall a proof be said to be com-

† Spirit of Laws, b. 12. c. 3.

plete? The answer must be,—when the judges are satisfied; if the process be regular. For what is implied by the term to prove?

The jurists acquaint us, that to prove is to convince the judge.

Probare est fidem facere judici. And this is the meaning assigned to the term by the English language. The common saying, as used in argument, where a fact is disputed, —*I will prove this to you,—I will convince you of this,—I will *satisfy you on this head,*—sufficiently show, that to * 21
prove, only implies, to convince another of the truth of our assertions.

The proof must be held to be complete, on the part of the prosecutor, when he produces the best evidence which the case will afford, and such as shall induce the judges to believe the commission of the fact, until it is refuted by opposite evidence on the part of the defendant† : one story is good, until another is told. Where the evidence is believed, and is sufficient to account for the fact, no other proof is necessary.

Hypothetical reasonings are susceptible of the highest degree of evidence, when the given *hypothesis* explains many *phenomena*, and contradicts none; and, when every other *hypothesis* is inconsistent with some of the *phenomena.* And this is the principle on which the philosophy of Sir Isaac Newton, as to the motion of the heavenly bodies, is founded.

Where there is no reason,—*not* to believe; that, alone, is a reason for believing the evidence of our senses.

*The senses are ever true, but the understanding often * 22
reasons ill. It is not proper to reject a probable opinion, without establishing a better in the room of it.

But these remarks are, after all, but barren generalities; and the observation of the great writers on this subject, will too often be found to be just,—that all proof is arbi-

† Indeed the proof is complete, on the part of the prosecution, when the best evidence has been produced. That is to say, the proof should be made to rest there, whatever the probable effect of the evidence on the court may or may not be.

trary, and cannot be reduced to positive rules. It happens, sometimes, that the most probable things are false; for, if they were always separated from falsehood, they would be certain, and not probable.—Or, as rendered by some other translators,—

The most probable things, sometimes prove false; because, if they were exempt from falsity, they would not be probable, but certain†.

It is likely several things may happen, which are not likely.

The ancient Romans were so sensible of the uncertainty of evidence, and the difficulty of always ascertaining the guilt of the prisoner, that their form of judgment, (or verdict of the jury as we would style it,) merely expressed, that he appeared to have done it, *fecisse videtur*.

* 23 It is not the fact, always, that constitutes the *guilt, but the opinion of the judge. "What have the laws ordered in such a case?" was asked of an advocate of Byzantium: "What I please," was the answer‡.

The end of a proof, is to establish the matter in debate. In every case, whether by direct proof, or by that of circumstantial evidence, the jury ought always to be fully satisfied of the guilt of the prisoner, before they return such a verdict. It is immaterial what the proof is, if it is not believed, and brings conviction to the mind of the jury.

It has been, of late years, a favourite theme, to descant upon the certainty of circumstantial evidence. The practice of the law, like other things, has its prejudices; and the name of an eminent man, the success of a particular trial, will sometimes give sanction to a false theory.

Circumstances, it is said, cannot lie. This is very true; but witnesses can. And from whom do you obtain circumstances, but from witnesses? Thus, you are liable to two deceptions: first, in the tale told by the witness; and, secondly, in your own application of those circumstances.

* 24 Where a fact is positively sworn *to, as seen by the wit-

† Aristotle, Vide Bayle Dict. Agathon.
‡ Travels of Anacharsis, v. 4. p. 400.

ness, the conclusion or inference to be drawn from it, is generally obvious. But, where the inference is to be drawn from a long train of circumstances, it is a matter of judgment; it is an exercise of the understanding; and, as all men do not understand alike, very opposite conclusions are sometimes drawn from the same shades of probability.

When the ancient prudence of the law denied to a prisoner the benefit of counsel, on a capital charge, to plead for him, it was understood that the proof should be so clear, as to be self-evident to the jury. It was understood that the judge should be counsel for the prisoner; that is to say, that he should see that the process was fair and regular, and that no undue advantages were taken; but that process is vitiated in its vital part, when a false principle is introduced.

"A presumption, which necessarily arises from circumstances, is very often more convincing, and more satisfactory, than any other kind of evidence; it is not within the reach and compass of human abilities to invent a train of circumstances, which shall be so connected together as to amount to a proof of guilt, without affording opportunities of contradicting a great part, if not all, of these circumstances."—(*Charge of Mr. Justice Buller, on the trial of Captain Donnellan.*)

*I deny the position. I maintain, that the theory is repugnant to the received principles of jurisprudence; as known to the best foreign writers on the law of evidence. I maintain, that it is not warranted by experience,—the greatest test of every rule, the proof of proofs. And I may further assert, that it is new to the practice of the English law. *25

First, I shall show, that the theory is repugnant to the received principles of jurisprudence, as known to the best foreign writers, on the law of evidence.

The first to whom I shall refer is Mascardus, a writer of great eminence on the general theory of proof; regarding which, he has published four volumes.

"Proof by evidence of the thing, is superior to every

other; and of all different kinds, none is so great as that which is made by witnesses deposing to what they have seen."†

"Proof, by presumption and conjectures," he observes in another place, "cannot be called a true and proper proof."‡

*26 *The work of Menochius is entirely dedicated to the doctrine of presumptions or circumstantial evidence; and although he displays that partiality for this species of proof, which is natural to one who has dedicated his attention to a particular subject, yet, in the very first chapter of his work, he observes, that "the proof or credence which arises from the testimony of witnesses, is superior to any other."§

I shall not think it necessary to load this essay with quotations from other writers on the civil law; the above two possess the most eminent authority of any on the subject of evidence. But the same opinion is expressed by every other author, whom I have had occasion to consult: no one has maintained the absurd position, that circumstances cannot lie; or, that conjectural proof is superior to that of ocular demonstration.

Secondly. I maintain, that it is not warranted by experience,—the great test of every rule.

It might appear invidious, to carry reference to cases of modern occurrence, where fatal mistakes have been discovered of persons too hastily convicted on mere circumstan-
*27 tial evidence; *the history of the judicial proceedings in this and in every other country, will afford too many illustrations.

Some cases of this kind will be found well illustrated in

† Probatio per evidentiam rei omnibus est potentior, et inter omnes ejus generis major est illa, quæ fit per testes de visu. (Mascardus de Probationibus, v. 1. q. 8. n. 8.)

‡ Probatio per presumptiones et conjecturas dici non potest vera et propria probatio.

§ Probatio seu fides quæ testibus fit, cœteris excellet. (Menochius de Præsumptionibus, l. 1. q. 1.)

Lord Chief Justice Hale's Pleas of the Crown, vol. 2. p. 289.†

Various instances occur, of the fatal error having been too late discovered; but who can say, how many instances have occurred, where the mistake has never been discovered?

It has often happened, that the real murderer has confessed the fact for which the innocent man has suffered; but, as real murderers do not always confess when innocent men suffer, it is impossible to say to what length this dangerous doctrine may have been carried.

Thirdly. I have further to observe, that this principle is new to the practice of the English law.

That great collection of criminal cases, which bears the name of the State Trials, contains a vast fund of legal knowledge.

The opinions of the judges, however, as expressed in state prosecutions, are not always to be regarded as law, until we reach the period of the revolution.

*New enactments of the legislature have changed some part of the law, and the improving experience of time has altered others. The first notice to be found of this principle, in sound and wholesome times, is on the trial of a Miss Blandy, for poisoning her father,---before Mr. Baron Legge, in 1752. *29

The judge, in summing up the evidence to the jury, declares that circumstances are more convincing and satisfactory than any other kind of evidence; because "*facts*," he says, "*cannot lie*."‡

That facts cannot lie, is sound logic no doubt. Men only lie. But as we only know facts through the medium of witnesses, the truth of the fact depends always upon the truth of the witness; so that, although he furnishes us with a thousand facts, it is of no consequence, if he himself is unsound.

The next occasion on which this doctrine appears, is on

† See Appendix.

‡ State Trials, v. 10. p. 32.

the celebrated trial of Captain Donnellan, in 1781, before Mr. Justice Buller, in the passage already quoted. But he has altered the position a little, by shifting the criterion
* 29 *from facts to circumstances. Facts, before, were the standard of truth; circumstances are now made to be so. For circumstances cannot lie. But what else are circumstances but facts, or *minor* facts; and I must take the liberty to say, that circumstances are still more liable to deceive, or to lead to deception, than even facts. A fact being more an object of sight, is easier apprehended by the senses than a circumstance; which, from its triviality often escapes the attention altogether, is misapprehended, or assigned to a wrong cause.

The trial in question, will afford a most unparalleled illustration of the truth of this observation; it will show the fallibility of circumstances, and the very opposite conclusions which different men will draw from the same appearances.

I shall here give the general shape of the case:—

> If shape it might be called, which shape had none,—
> Or, substance might be called, which shadow seemed.

Sir Theodosius Boughton, a young man of a delicate constitution, had sent to a country apothecary's shop for a draught of medicine. Different phials appear to have been in his chamber, at the time he took the draught; which
* 30 was *intended to be a composition of rhubarb, jalap, and lavender water.

He was suddenly seized with convulsions in his stomach, and foaming at the mouth; and expired before he could give any explanation. On rinsing one of the phials, the sediment gave the effluvia of laurel water, which is known to be a strong poison. Convulsions, foaming at the mouth, and sudden death, are the natural effects of that liquid.

But every man who dies in that way, is not, therefore, poisoned. The apoplexy will produce the same effects and appearances: of which disease, the father of the young man was known to have died. No evidence whatever was produced as to the existence of the laurel water.

Captain Donnellan, the brother-in-law of Sir Theodosius, was living in his house at the time of the accident. He was the next heir to the estate, and, accordingly, the person who had the most immediate interest in his death. He certainly betrayed some uneasiness on the event, and appearances indicated that he was afraid of being suspected as the author of the mischief. But, if it was natural that he should be suspected, if the *cui bono* points out the actor of a nefarious deed, it was not unnatural that he should find himself placed under circumstances *of peculiar delicacy, and manifest embarrassment and confusion in his conduct. * 31

Captain Donnellan was brought to trial, on a charge of poisoning Sir Theodosius Boughton.

The leading point in every case of this sort, is—did the deceased die of poison? For, if he did not, there is an end of the whole. Where there was no poison, there was no poisoner.

But this was altogether a question to be decided by the opinion of medical men. From what then did they form their opinion? From any of those broad marks, respecting which all men judge alike. No; there was nothing of the kind to guide their judgment. The whole cause turned on circumstances, from first to last. Presumptions were formed on conjectures; and conjectures supposed from circumstances never proved. Four physicians inspected the body, on dissection, the eleventh day after the death. They gave their opinion to the jury, and described the circumstances on which that opinion was founded; those four said, they believed him to have died of poison.

The circumstances on which they had given their opinion, were stated, at the trial, to Doctor John Hunter, the most eminent physician of the age. He declared he could not discover, in any one of those circumstances, nor in all of them *united, any sign of the deceased having died from poison, nor any symptoms beyond those incident to a man dying suddenly. * 32

Q. from the court to Mr. Hunter. Then, in your judg-

ment, upon the appearance the gentlemen have described, no inference can be drawn from thence that Sir Theodosius Boughton died of poison?—*A.* Certainly not; it does not give the least suspicion.

In questions of science, and above all in those of medical science, the faith to be reposed in any opinion, will be regulated by the professional eminence of the person giving it. One man's sight being generally as good as that of another, as to a mere matter of fact; as whether he saw, or did not see such a thing, the learned and the ignorant are upon a par, and one witness to a fact is just as good as another. But the case is very different as to a matter of science; for one man's judgment will outweigh that of many. Upon a point of law or equity, we would not put the opinion of a country attorney, or of four country attorneys, against that of a chief justice. Doctor John Hunter stood, at that time, at the very head of his profession; his opinion gave the law to that profession, both in England and in every country in Europe. Had the profession been
* 33 to estimate his opinion, and not the jury, a *very different verdict would have been given. The case referred peculiarly to Doctor Hunter's line of study,—that of dissection, and the appearances incident to a body on sudden and convulsive death. He pronounced, that the dissection had been irregularly made, and in a way not to afford the true criterion to judge by. And, where the process is irregular, when the experiment is defective, the conclusion must always be vague and doubtful.

The gentlemen composing the jury, did not perhaps know the eminence of Mr. Hunter's character; nor, consequently, the weight due to his opinion. But the judge, on the bench, no doubt knew this; and in balancing the evidence, and in summing up, it was clearly his duty to have stated the great weight to be attached to Mr. Hunter's observations. He stated nothing of all this; but took them numerically, "four medical men to one."

Thus, from an irregular dissection, a positive conclusion was admitted.

It is a rule of law, and above all in cases of life and death, that the want of any one circumstance will prevent the effect of the whole. Thus, if the dissection was irregular, the opinion formed in reference to that dissection was a mere nothing.

*As well may you suppose that proposition itself to be true, which you wish to prove, as that other, whereby you hope to prove it. * 34

Post hoc; ergo propter hoc—is a species of argument which often leads to fallacy.

Because the fact immediately followed; therefore it was occasioned by that which it followed. He died immediately after taking the medicine; therefore, he was killed by the medicine.

The present question is, was the process on the trial according to law? Was the conclusion arrived at by regular and legal forms? The grounds on which the legal inference is to be drawn, must always of themselves be clear and certain; there is no presumption upon a presumption; there is no inference from a fact not known.

When the judgment of the law is passed in reference to a certain thing, the existence of that thing should be first clearly made to appear.

The fact of poisoning ought to have been established, beyond a shadow of doubt, before any person was convicted as the poisoner.

But the jury, it will be said, were satisfied on this point. Had the evidence been duly summed up by the judge; had they been told, as they ought to have been, that in experimental philosophy, such as tracing the effects of a par-
*ticular poison, in tracing the causes, so many and so com- * 35
plicated that lead to death, if the experiment is defective, if the process is vitiated in one instance, the result is also vitiated and defective. Every practitioner in philosophy is sensible and aware of this truth; and wherever he finds that he has erred in his experiment, he sets the case aside, as affording no satisfactory result, and renews his process in another subject.

But, unfortunately, it is a matter of pride, in some men, to be always certain in their opinion, and to appear beyond the influence of doubt. Very different was the practice of that modest and eminent man who gave his evidence on this trial: he was accustomed to the fallaciousness of appearances,—to the danger of hasty inferences from imperfect proofs, and refused to give his assent to an opinion, without facts being first produced to support it. "If I knew," said Mr. Hunter, "that the draught was poison, I should say, most probably, that the symptoms arose from that; but when I don't know that that draught was poison, when I consider that a number of other things might occasion his death, I cannot answer positively to it."

During the whole course of this celebrated trial, there was not a single fact established by evidence, except the
* 36 death, and the convulsive *appearances at the moment. These appearances, Mr. Hunter declared, afforded no suspicion whatever of poison, and were generally incident to sudden death, in what might be called a state of health; not only there was no fact proved, but there was not one single circumstance proved. One circumstance was supposed from another, equally suppositious, and from two fictions united a third was produced. The existence of the laurel water was thus made out: the sediment found in the phial, from which the unfortunate young man had drunk, was supposed to smell like bitter almonds; for, as the smell of laurel water was not then known to Lady Boughton, she could not trace the resemblance further; bitter almonds were supposed to smell like laurel water.

It is here to be observed, that the smell attached to the phial was momentary, for it was washed out almost immediately, and could not be twice experienced. But what so uncertain as the sense of smell? Of all the human senses, it is the most uncertain, the most variable, and fallacious. It is often different in different men, and different in the same person, at one hour, from what it is at the next; a cold, a slight indisposition, the state of the stomach, a sudden exposure to the air, will extenuate or destroy this impression.

*But this train of proof was altogether at variance with first principles. In law, as already observed, the arguments should be drawn from one reality to another; but here, the argument turned upon the breath, the smell of a woman, distracted at the moment, with the loss of her son, and ready to ascribe that evil to the first thing that came in her way.

All proof must begin at a fixed point. The law never admits of an inference from an inference. Two imperfect things cannot make one perfect. That which is weak, may be made stronger; but that which has no substance, cannot be corroborated. The question is never what a thing is like; but the witness must swear to his belief, as to what it is. A simile is no argument. Upon the principle, that comparison of hands is no evidence, in a criminal trial, comparison of smells must be held to be equally defective. Besides, there are a variety of articles, that resemble bitter almonds in the smell, and many of these altogether innoxious.

In circumstantial evidence, the circumstance and the presumption are too often confounded; as they seem to have been throughout this trial. The circumstance is always a fact; the presumption is the inference drawn from that fact. It is hence called presumptive proof; because it proceeds *merely on presumption or opinion. But the *38
circumstance itself is never to be presumed, but must be substantively proved. An argument ought to consist in something that is itself admitted; for who can prove one doubtful thing by another. If it was not laurel water, that Sir Theodosius drank, the proof fails as to the effect; and, certainly, some of the usual proofs, some of the common *indicia* or marks of things, should have been established. Where did the prisoner procure it? From whom did he obtain it? Where, and what time,—and by whom, or how did he administer it?† Nothing of this kind was proved.

† Venenum arguis: ubi emi? a quo? quanti? per quem dedi? quo consciо? Quintilian l. 5. c. 8. s. 37.

The whole proof, as to laurel water, rested upon the comparison of the smell. Question to Doctor Parsons—" You ground your opinion upon the description of its smell by Lady Boughton? Answer. " Yes, we can ground our opinion upon nothing else but that, and the subsequent effects."

But the judgment of the cause from its effects, Mr. Hunter has already shown to be equally conjectural as that formed from its resemblance in smell.

* 39 *The proof proceeds. He was supposed to be poisoned, because it was believed to be laurel water; and it was believed to be laurel water, because he was supposed to be poisoned. We will not say that both these suppositions might not have been true; yet still they were but conjectures, unsupported by any proof, and formed against all the rules of law.

But the accused, it is said, furnished the proof against himself, by his own distrust of his innocence. He no doubt betrayed great apprehensions of being charged with the murder; but are innocent men never afraid of being thought guilty?

We readily recognise all the general truisms, and common-place observations, as to the confidence of innocence, and the consciousness of guilt; but we find, from history, that innocence loses its confidence, when oppressed with prejudice; and that men have been convicted of crimes, which they never committed, from the very means which they have taken to clear themselves.

" An uncle who had the bringing up of his niece, to whom he was heir at law, correcting her for some offence, she was heard to say, 'good uncle, do not kill me;' after which time the child could not be found; whereupon the
* 40 uncle *was committed upon suspicion of murder, and admonished, by the justices of the assize, to find out the child by the next assizes; against which time he could not find her, but brought another child, as like her in person and years as he could find, and apparelled her like the true child; but on examination she was found not to be the

true child. Upon these presumptions, (which were considered to be as strong as facts that appear in the broad face of day,) he was found guilty and executed: but the truth was, the child, being beaten, ran away, and was received by a stranger; and afterwards, when she came of age to have her land, came and demanded it, and was directly proved to be the true child."†

The above case was referred to by Lord Mansfield, in his speech in the Douglas cause, as an illustration that forgery, and falsehood itself, has been sometimes used to defend even an innocent cause. "It was no uncommon thing," he observed, "for a man to defend a good cause by foul means, or false pretences."

Captain Donnellan was liable to suspicion, and to great suspicion, on the general relations of the subject, independent of particular circumstances, *and would have been 41 *
suspected by all the world, had he been never so innocent.

In the first place, it was a well-known fact, that he had been obliged either to quit the army, (to which he originally belonged,) or had been cashiered by the sentence of a court martial.

Secondly, he was of all other men the person who was to have gained by the death of Sir Theodosius Boughton; to whose estate and property he succeeded as his brother-in-law. No other human being had an interest in the case. Such is the disposition in human nature, (founded perhaps on a too just knowledge of our feelings and principles of action,) that first suspicion always points to the person who is to gain by it, as the author of any mischief of which the real perpetrator is not known. The *cui bono* was not invented by Cassius Severus, to whom it is ascribed,—but every man is alike *the rock of the accused*, in this respect.

If, therefore, it was natural, on general grounds, that Mr. Donnellan should be so suspected, it was also natural for him to be sensible that he would be so, and consequently, to be alarmed, distracted, and uneasy.

† Hale's Pleas of the Crown, v. 2. p. 290.

But it will be said, that, granting all this, he displayed
*42 more uneasiness than was even natural *to one in his situation. It is a delicate thing to answer this question,—it is a nice thing to fix the standard of human feelings,—and to say what degree of perturbation a man, already branded with guilt and conviction, shall feel when placed under circumstances which make him to be suspected of a capital crime.

Lawyers, and those accustomed to see and advise with persons in that unfortunate predicament, can only tell the terrible apprehensions that every man feels at the idea of being a second time brought to a public trial; it is altogether a new view of human nature, and we seldom estimate, rightly, feelings which we have never experienced, nor expect to experience in our own persons, nor have witnessed in that of others;—

> "To thee no reason,—
> "Who good has only known, and evil has not proved."

They who have been accustomed to carry on criminal prosecutions, must be fully aware of the influence which a former trial and conviction is calculated to have on almost any accusation; but in no case can that influence be greater than where the trial turns on presumptive proof. For
*43 here it is often the feelings, the prejudices, *and opinion of the jury, that supply the want of evidence.

Suspicion is to be distinguished from proof,—a thousand suspicions do not form one proof. We understand, in common language, by the term suspicion, the imagining of something ill, without proof. It may, therefore, form a proper ground of accusation, but never of conviction: it seems to arise from the general semblance of things, and often from the morals of the individual, rather than from any distinct act. Thus, in the civil law, a guardian is regarded as suspected, whose morals render him so.

A suspicion is one thing, and a necessary inference another: a suspicion is an impression on another man's mind,—an inference is made from the fact itself.

There certainly was no overt act proved against the prisoner during the whole course of this trial; it was not proved that he gave the poison, or saw it given, or had such in his possession. Many things, no doubt, in his demeanor and conversation, gave strong suspicions against him; but, if the civil law positively forbids a man being condemned on suspicion, can that be justified by ours?

"The wisdom and goodness of our law appears in nothing more remarkably, than in the *perspicuity, certainty, and clearness of the evidence it requires to fix a crime upon any man, whereby his life, his liberty, or his property can be concerned: herein we glory and pride ourselves, and are justly the envy of all our neighbour nations. Our law, in such cases, requires evidence so clear and convincing, that every bystander, the instant he hears it, must be fully satisfied of the truth and certainty of it. It admits of no surmises, innuendoes, forced consequences, or harsh constructions, nor any thing else to be offered as evidence, but what is real and substantial, according to the rules of natural justice and equity."† * 44

We have been the more full in our observations on this trial, because it has been so often quoted with a sort of triumph, as forming a model and illustration of the nature of circumstantial evidence. It is an illustration, indeed, of how little evidence one man has been convicted on; but it is an illustration of nothing else.‡

We can never bring ourselves to believe, that it is necessary to forfeit the life of a man on bare *suspicion, on presumptions without proof, and on inferences unsupported by evidence. * 45

A rule of conduct, to be good, must be so on general grounds, and in reference to the state of society in which we are placed; and, happily, the wholesome state of British morals does not require that men should be convicted on any evidence but that which is established by law, and warranted by sound reason.

† Lord Cowper's Speech on the Bishop of Rochester's trial.

‡ See Appendix, No. 2.

The mischief of a nice conviction does not rest with the particular case; precedents are grounds of law by the English practice, and indeed the most general ground of our law of evidence.

We have, in more than one instance, witnessed the doctrine of circumstantial evidence being hastily applied by loose analogies and incidents, foreign to the intrinsic conditions of the subject. But we do not feel ourselves at liberty to hurt the tenderness due to living reputation, by recurrence to recent instances; we adopt the more agreeable duty of bearing testimony to the wise maxim of an eminent magistrate: "Nothing can be more dangerous or unjust, in matters of this nature," says Mr. Chief Justice Hyde, speaking of homicide, "than to establish material distinctions upon points which do not enter into the intrinsic merits of the case." (*East's Pleas of the Crown, p.* 241.)

*46 *The evidence of circumstances on every criminal trial, should be confined as much as possible to the actual commission of the fact.

The intention, indeed, must always precede the act, and is chiefly to be judged of by antecedent circumstances. But then each of these circumstances should be regarded as a fact to be proved and established by evidence; and, unless so established, ought never to form a ground of conviction. We must once more revert to the trial for illustration. On passing sentence, Mr. Justice Buller conveyed the following opinion as to the motives:—"Probably the greatness of his fortune caused the greatness of your offence; and I am fully satisfied, on the evidence given against you, that avarice was your motive, and hypocrisy served you with the means."

But where or how was this proved by evidence on the trial? The speech of a judge is to be taken out of the evidence adduced on the trial;—if it is not so limited, it may be difficult to fix its bounds.

In a criminal trial, and more especially in the trial for a capital offence, every thing is supposed to be governed by

fixed and known rules. There is here no room for the discretion of a judge; the proof by which the prisoner is to be tried is as fixed as the law which condemns the *crime; at least, the principles of that proof are to be stated by the judge to the jury, as known and received maxims of reason, handed down by a long train of precedents, or fixed by statutary enactment. "Whatever the rules in Westminster Hall are, it is not therefore reason because it is a rule; but because it is reason, and reason approved of by long experience, therefore it is a rule." (*State Trials*, *vol.* 4. *p.* 291.) The opinion of Mr. Justice Buller might have been very just, but if it was not regularly formed, it was extra judicial and of dangerous example. *47

It is an observation warranted by the history of our criminal law, that all the instances by which innocent men have lost their lives, have arisen from precedents against guilty men†; but laws were meant to protect the innocent, as well as to punish the guilty.

The following observation, by Lord Bacon, suggests the caution with which men should give their assent to any proposition founded on a mere similarity of circumstances:—"The mind," he observes, "has this property,—that it readily supposes a greater order and conformity in things than it finds, and although many things in nature are singular, and extremely dissimilar, *yet the mind is still imagining parallel correspondence and relations betwixt them which have no existence. *48

"Nor does this folly," he adds, "prevail only in abstract tenets, but also in simple notions." (*Novum organum*, *s.* 2. *aphorim* 45.)

Every one may prove the justice of these remarks, by his reflections on what he sees every day occurring in common life.

Weak men are always the first to assent and to admit of loose analogies, imperfect resemblances, and inferences without proof,—whilst men of stronger minds, and more

† Omnia mala exempla, ex bonis initiis orta sunt.

reflection, look out for distinctions; they search for discriminations in subjects nearly similar, and are slow in yielding their assent to first impressions. Judgment consists in distinguishing things which are nearly alike, without exactly being so.

In the general prejudice, which at present prevails for circumstantial evidence, the mind, I am afraid, is rather disposed to look out for analogies and resemblances, than for discrimination.

In almost every trial, it is the interest of the accuser to accumulate his proofs, whilst the safety of the prisoner consists in considering these, separate and apart; this practice, therefore, has a tendency rather to convict than to acquit.

*49 *We should lament to advance any thing that might tend to weaken the facility of detecting crimes; but that facility may be increased, by establishing certain rules for the determination of proof.

Without presuming to state a body of general rules, we may be allowed to show where some obvious principles have been violated. All instruction proceeds safest by negatives and exclusives to what is positive and affirmative. And it was this principle which led us to dwell so particularly on the above case. We conceive one great error has arisen from the popular saying, that circumstances cannot lie; from the idea that circumstantial evidence is equivalent to direct proof.

And, perhaps, from the vanity of forming resemblances, where, (if that passion in the judicial character is ever allowable,) the vanity should rather be in perceiving distinctions.

Nothing is more dangerous in the mouth of a judge, than popular brocards, barren generalities, and loose unsettled maxims, which carry away the attention of the jury from the intrinsic evidence of the case itself, and prevent the free exercise of their own understandings. It is not every juryman that can understand a general theory, but every
*50 man of sense can compare *what he hears at the trial, with

similar circumstances, as falling under his own experience; and so estimate for himself the credibility of the evidence.

I deprecate an argumentative judge, reasoning a jury into a belief of guilt or innocence, rather than leaving them to judge from their own feelings; from those feelings which God and nature have bestowed on them, as the safeguard of innocence, and the true measure of human conduct.

The following observation, in the charge so often alluded to, deserves particular remark:—"It is not within the reach and compass of human abilities to invent a train of circumstances which shall be so connected together as to amount to a proof, without affording opportunities of contradicting a great part, if not all, of these circumstances."

This is one of those general sayings which, coming from high authority, is allowed to pass without examination, and, from being often repeated, no one thinks to doubt of its truth. No other remark, however, was ever more refuted by experience. If the observation was just, we should find it illustrated by practice; but we know that there are infinitely more instances of mistaken convictions on circumstantial evidence, than by any other species of proof whatever. *"Reducing general words to particular facts, clears the sophistry of them."† We accordingly refer to the Appendix, No. 1. for an enumeration of various irregular convictions in that way, both in Great Britain and in different countries in Europe. * 51

I beg here to dwell, a little more minutely, on the hardship of requiring a prisoner to controvert a train of circumstantial evidence. For, how can a prisoner, altogether innocent of the charge, controvert circumstances, or an account of events, with which he is unacquainted. A man, charged with the commission of a crime, at a period long anterior to the trial, if innocent, and at a distance from the place, at the time of its occurrence, can only establish his innocence by one of two methods:—first, by

† Remarks on College's trial, by Sir J. Hawles. State Trials, vol. 3. p. 621.

showing a contradiction in the circumstances of the proof itself; or, secondly, by establishing an *alibi*,—that is, by showing that he was at a different place at the time.† In regard to the first mode of refuting the charge: if he is
* 52 ignorant of the *facts, if he is unaccustomed to the nature of legal argument, he may not easily confute the chain of circumstances. A premeditated story is always so made up as to bear the appearance of consistency. Men will believe a probable falsehood rather than a singular truth; and, in regard to the proof of an *alibi*, if the prisoner does not happen to recollect the day, or cannot perhaps recall to mind where he chanced to be on that day, he is left without a defence. The proof of a negative is always difficult, often impossible.

But what is the situation of a person charged with a capital crime?—Suspicions of this sort generally fall upon the needy and unfortunate. He is brought from a jail, where he has been perhaps long confined, distracted and agitated with his situation; he has none to assist him or suggest to him what course to pursue; and no counsel is allowed to plead for him, and assert his innocency of the facts charged. A long train of circumstances are offered by the witnesses, of the whole of which he is ignorant, and, therefore, unprepared to ask the necessary questions, or to point out to the jury the incongruity of the story advanced:—his very attempt to do so, unsuccessfully, (that is to say, if he makes observations on the evidence, which
* 53 are not explanatory *or correct,) will be held an argument of his guilt. But the facts have been sworn to, and his personal appearance is perhaps against him; and his character,—it may be, suffering under prejudice. If a weak magistrate happens to sit on the bench, (and weak men sometimes find their way to the bench, as well as to other places;) if the judge is infirm, or his attention exhausted by the fatigue of a long trial; and if, in summing up, he loses sight of the chain of incidents, assumes a fact as es-

† The character of the witnesses is, no doubt, always a matter of the most important consideration.

tablished before it is so,—endeavours to prove facts by other facts, which are not proved themselves,—forgets the attention which is due to the character of the witnesses, and has allowed the counsel for the prosecution, in his opening speech, to prejudice and inflame the minds of the jury!—

It were superfluous to ask what the result of such a trial must naturally be? We hope, and believe, that such a concurrence of incidents, hostile to justice, is very uncommon.

But to return to the proposition in the charge: can it ever be admitted that the number of circumstances alleged against a prisoner, facilitates their refutation? Surely the difficulty of defence is increased by the multiplicity of proof that it has to contend with! The attention is distracted; and the very embarrassment incident to the oc-
*casion, is alone sufficient to bereave any common man of *54
his faculties.

The civil law has foreseen the embarrassments, which a prisoner must always be under, from a variety of witnesses being produced against him; and has, therefore, left it to the discretion of the judge to moderate their number. It might as well be said, that a prisoner has an advantage in the multiplicity of witnesses opposed to him, because if false he can always refute some of them.

But, if you break the chain of circumstances, it will be said, in one link, the whole structure falls to the ground. This no doubt, ought to be the consequence. But is the fact so? Does experience warrant the observation? Are we to suppose that all those who have been irregularly convicted, made no defence, and broke no part of the chain? They must naturally have offered something to the consideration of the jury. Yet still, we see, that the general effect of the whole, the multiplicity of the circumstances, pointing against the prisoner, has been thought sufficient to warrant conviction.

It happens, not unfrequently, that a prisoner is not apprized of the evidence intended to be produced against

him. If the case is altogether false on the part of the prosecution, the difficulty *of defence is increased. For a man can only refute a false story, by being acquainted with some part of it. The true case must always be opposed to the false one. Thus, in the case of two men who were tried some few years ago, for the murder of Mr. Steele, on Hounslow Heath, a long detail of the circumstances attending the occasion, was given in evidence against them. But if they were not, as they asserted, present on the occasion, and knew nothing of either Mr. Steele or the murder, how was it possible for them to refute or disprove the circumstances?

*55

The accusation was not brought until some years after the murder. They could not bring to recollection where they were on that day, and so failed in establishing an alibi.

A different man has been since brought to trial for that very murder. It is true, that the judges did not allow the evidence to be entered upon, because they thought that it was insufficient, on the statement of the counsel in his opening speech.

It should be always kept in mind, that circumstantial evidence is merely supplemental; and is only resorted to from the want of original and direct proof. And it never can be said that what is secondary, is equal to that which is original,—the thing substituted equal to that which it is meant to supply.

*56

*And this distinction seems fully recognised by Lord Chief Baron Gilbert. "When the fact itself cannot be proved, that which comes nearest to the proof of the fact, is the proof of the circumstances that necessarily and usually attend such facts, and called presumptions; and not proof, for they stand instead of the proofs of the fact till the contrary be proved." (Gilbert's Law of Evidence, vol. 1. p. 142.)

A regard to the peace and good order of society, certainly requires that crimes shall be liable to be proved by circumstantial evidence. But a regard to the well being of society likewise demands, that the mode of proof should

be regulated by some fixed rules. If the nature of the thing admits of but few rules, for that very reason, those few should be the more distinctly observed. This principle is excellently illustrated by the deep Gravina, who somewhere observes, (for the book is not at hand for reference,) that as the military state admits of but few laws, those few should be the more distinctly observed, as they could only have been introduced into an army or camp from a strong sense of their necessity.

Legal proceedings would be vague and uncertain, judges would become arbitrary, and innocence would be exposed to the resentment of *witnesses, if some general and fixed rules were not observed for the discovery of truth. * 57

Of these the following are perhaps the chief:—

1st.—*The actual commission of the crime itself* (*the* corpus delicti) *shall be clearly established.*

2*nd.*—*Each circumstance shall be distinctly proved.*

3*rd.*—*The circumstance relied on, shall be such as is necessarily or usually incident to the fact charged.*

4*th.*—*When the number of circumstances depend on the testimony of one witness, that number shall not increase the strength of the proof.* For, as the whole depends on the veracity of the witness, when that fails the whole fails.

5*th.*—*Direct evidence shall not be held refuted from being opposed to circumstances incongruous with that evidence.* Because a certain degree of incongruity is incident to every man's conduct.

6*th.*—*The judge in summing up, shall assume no fact or circumstance as proved; but shall state the whole hypothetically and conditionally; leaving it entirely to the jury, to determine how far the case is made out to their satisfaction.*

7*th.*—*The difficulty of proving the negative shall in all cases be allowed due weight.* But the silence of the prisoner as to facts, which, if innocent, he might have explained, shall be held an * argument against him. This, of course, proceeds upon the supposition, that he stood fully apprized, before his trial, of all that was intended to be produced. * 58

8*th.*—*The counsel for the prisoner shall be allowed to ob-*

ject freely to the production of any evidence, as not proper to go to the jury, or as not being of legal credence. On Captain Donnellan's trial, the counsel do not appear to have always availed themselves of this privilege.

The liberty of objecting to any piece of evidence, ought, on every occasion, to be strenuously exerted; as supplying, in a great measure, the right of making the defence.

9th.—The jury shall be as fully convinced of the guilt of the prisoner, from the combination of the circumstances, as if direct proof had been brought.

It should always be considered, whether the connexion betwixt the circumstances and the crime is necessary, or only casual and contingent; and whether, therefore, the circumstances necessarily involve the guilt of the prisoner, or only probably so; whether these circumstances might not all exist, and yet the accused be innocent.

It seems desirable, that some inchoate act, approaching
* 59 to the crime, should be proved *on the prisoner; and that he should not be convicted on general appearances,—such as from being found in a certain situation. The improper convictions seem chiefly to have been owing to a neglect of this rule. Strong appearances, but without any act proved against the prisoner, have too often turned out unfounded.

It is sometimes said, in summing up by the judge, that the evidence is the best that the nature of the case can be supposed to afford; but this, certainly, is no reason for the jury being satisfied with it. In the first place, the nature of the case is only to be known by the evidence. The case of an innocent man must always be of a nature to afford very little evidence; but the jury, let the case be what it will, must be distinctly persuaded of the guilt of the prisoner, before they return such a verdict. Agreeably to the common law, where the facts have gone regularly before a jury, and there is no misdirection from the judge in summing up, the proof is complete. When the jury is satified, the law is satisfied. No principle can be at once

more calculated to facilitate the detection of crimes, to ensure the safety of innocence, and to maintain the general peace of society.

10*th.—Where the body of the act is distinctly sworn to, a variation in the circumstances does not *destroy the proof.—* 60
" If several independent witnesses, of fair character, should agree in all the parts of a story, (in testifying, for instance, that a murder or a robbery was committed at a particular time, in a particular place, and by a certain individual,) every court of justice in the world would admit the fact, notwithstanding the abstract possibility of the whole being false. Again, if several honest men should agree in saying, that he saw the King of France beheaded, though they should disagree as to the figure of the guillotine, or the size of his executioner, as to the king's hands being bound or loose, as to his being composed or agitated in ascending the scaffold, yet every court of justice in the world would think, that such difference, respecting the circumstances of the fact, did not invalidate the evidence respecting the fact itself.

" When you speak of the whole of a story, you cannot mean every particular circumstance connected with the history, but not essential to it; you must mean the pith and marrow of the story; for it would be impossible to establish the truth of any fact, (of Admirals Byng or Keppel, for example, having neglected or not neglected their duty,) if a disagreement in the evidence of witnesses, in minute points, should be considered *as annihilating the weight of * 61
their evidence in points of importance. In a word, the relation of a fact differs essentially from the demonstration of a theorem; if one step is left out, one link in the chain of ideas constituting a demonstration is omitted, the conclusion will be destroyed; but a fact may be established notwithstanding a disagreement of the witnesses in certain trifling particulars of their evidence respecting it."†

† Apology for the Bible, p. 224.

We shall search in vain, our State Trials, for a happier illustration of the principle, than the above, from the elegant pen of Doctor Watson.

The following rule is the converse of the preceding one:

11*th.—Where the leading fact or crime is only to be collected from circumstances, a material variation in these will defeat the effect of the whole.*

For, as each particular is to have an effect on the general conclusion, a variation in the circumstances may give a different colour to the whole transaction.

A system of propositions is only true, because each of the propositions, of which it is composed, is true.

*62 *12*th.—There being no repugnance in the chain of circumstances, is a proof that a thing may be; not that it is: though there being a repugnance, is a proof that it cannot be.* Whatever does not involve a contradiction, is possible; whatever involves one, is impossible.

13*th.—The absence of the proof, naturally to be expected, is a strong argument against the existence of any fact alleged.* This applies particularly to cases where violence is charged.

"It is an undoubted truth," (Lord Mansfield observed in the Douglas cause,) "that judges, in forming their opinion of events, and in deciding upon the truth or falsehood of controverted facts, must be guided by the rules of probability; and, as mathematical or absolute certainty, is seldom to be attained in human affairs, reason and public utility require, that judges, and all mankind, in forming their opinion of the truth of facts, should be regulated by the superior number of the probabilities on the one side or the other, whether the amount of these probabilities be expressed in words and arguments, or by figures and numbers."

Applied to the affairs of civil life in reference to which the observation was made, the proposition is excellent; but the rule does not hold in criminal cases. The impression
*63 on the mind *of the jury, in a criminal case, must be, not that the prisoner is probably guilty, but that he really and absolutely is so;—where they doubt, they are to acquit.

"Literary men," it has been observed, "have marked superiority over lawyers, whenever they assume their profession."

It is often said, in respect to evidence of this sort, if you break the chain of circumstances, the whole falls to the ground. It is material, always, to be apprised of the meaning of terms, before we argue as to their effect. What is the import of the term? In what does this interruption consist? The Douglas cause turned entirely on circumstantial evidence; yet neither the speeches of the judges, nor the singularly acute letters of Mr. Stewart, on the subject of the trial, afford any solution of the term. The chain appears, on both sides of the question, repeatedly broken, and as often renewed: the want of the fact is supplied by argument, and the argument invalidated by the want of the fact, in endless prolixity.

We hazard an explanation of it with great diffidence:—the chain of circumstances is broke, whenever there is such a defect in the thread of the narrative as cannot be accounted for; or, such a contradiction in the statement, as is irreconcileable with probability.

We will not add to the number of the above rules, lest we might appear to aim at forming a *technical system for the belief or disbelief of facts, independent of the free exercise of the understanding over the circumstances of the case. * 64

We must never bind ourselves down to believe or disbelieve, on general grounds, abstracted from the condition of times, persons, motives, and all the variety of relations of which the particular case happens to consist. Irregular, capricious, and shifting as man is, in all his actions, we can never establish absolute grounds for judging of these.

Quæ argumenta ad quem modum probandæ cuique rei sufficiant, nullo certo modo satis definiri potest.

Ex sententia animi tui te æstimare oportet, quid aut credas, aut parum probatum tibi opinaris, (ff. lib. 22. tit. 5. s. 3.)

APPENDIX.

CASE I.

John Jennings, who was executed at Hull, for a Highway Robbery, in the Year 1742.

A GENTLEMAN, travelling to Hull, was stopped late in the evening, about seven miles short of it, by a single highwayman, with a mask on, who robbed him of a purse containing twenty guineas. The highwayman rode off a different road, full speed, and the gentleman pursued his journey. It, however, growing late, and he being already much affrighted and agitated at what had passed, he rode only two miles farther, and stopped at the Bell Inn, kept by Mr. James Brunell. He went into the kitchen to give directions for his supper, where he related, to several persons present, his having been robbed; to which he added this peculiar circumstance, that when he travelled he always gave his gold a particular mark; that every guinea in the purse he was robbed of, was so particularly *marked * 66
and that, most probably, the robber, by that means, would be detected. Supper being ready, he retired. He had not long finished his supper, before Mr. Brunell came into the parlour. After the usual inquiries of landlords, of hoping the supper and every thing was to his liking, &c. &c. "Sir," says he, "I understand that you have been robbed, not far from hence, this evening."—"I have, Sir." "And that your money was all marked?"—"It was."—"A circumstance has arisen which leads me to think that I can point out the robber."—"Indeed!"—"Pray, sir, what time in the evening was it?"—"It was just setting in to be dark."—"The time confirms my suspicions!" Mr.

Brunell then informed the gentleman that he had a waiter, one John Jennings, who had, of late, been so very full of money, at times, and so very extravagant, that he had had many words with him about it, and had determined to part with him on account of his conduct being so very suspicious; that, long before dark, that day, he had sent him out to change a guinea for him, and that he had only come back since he (the gentleman) was in the house, saying, he could not get change; and that Jennings being in liquor, he had sent him to bed, resolving to discharge him
*67 in the morning. That, at the *time he returned him the guinea, he (Mr. Brunell) did not think it was the same which he had given him to get silver for, having perceived a mark upon this, which he was very clear was not upon the other; but that, nevertheless, he should have thought no more of the matter, as Jennings had so frequently gold of his own in his pocket, had he not afterwards heard, (for he was not present when the gentleman was in his kitchen relating it,) the particulars of the robbery, and that the guineas, which the highwayman had taken, were all marked; that, however, a few minutes previously to his having heard this, he had unluckily paid away the guinea which Jennings returned him, to a man who lived some distance off, and was gone; but the circumstance of it struck him so very strongly, that he could not, as an honest man, refrain from giving this information.

Mr. Brunell was thanked for his attention and public spirit. There was the strongest room for suspecting of Jennings; and if, on searching him, any of the marked guineas should be found, as the gentleman could swear to them, there would then remain no doubt. It was now agreed to go softly up to his room: Jennings was fast asleep; his pockets were searched, and from one of them
*68 was drawn forth a purse, containing *exactly nineteen guineas. Suspicion now became demonstration, for the gentleman declared them to be identically those which he had been robbed of! Assistance was called, Jennings was awaked, dragged out of bed, and charged with the robbe-

ry. He denied it firmly, but circumstances were too strong to gain him belief. He was secured that night, and the next day carried before a neighbouring justice of the peace. The gentleman and Mr. Brunell deposed the facts on oath; and Jennings having no proofs, nothing but mere assertions of innocence to oppose them, which could not be credited, he was committed to take his trial at the next assizes.

So strong were the circumstances known to be against him, that several of his friends advised him to plead guilty on his trial, and to throw himself on the mercy of the court. This advice he rejected, and, when arraigned, pleaded not guilty. The prosecutor swore to the being robbed; but that, it being nearly dark, the highwayman in a mask, and himself greatly terrified, he could not swear to the prisoner's person, though he thought him of much the same stature as the man who robbed him. To the purse and guineas, which were produced in court, he swore,—as to the purse, positively,—and as to the marked guineas, to the best of his belief, and that they were found in the prisoner's pocket.

*The prisoner's master, Mr. Brunell, deposed to the fact, as to the sending of the prisoner to change a guinea, and of his having brought him back a marked one, in the room of the one he gave him unmarked. He also gave evidence as to the finding of the purse, and the nineteen marked guineas, in the prisoner's pocket. And, what consummated the proof, the man to whom Mr. Brunell paid the guinea, produced the same, and gave testimony to the having taken it, that night, in payment, of the prisoner's master. Mr. Brunell gave evidence of his having received of the prisoner that guinea, which he afterwards paid to this last witness. And the prosecutor comparing it with the other nineteen, found in the pocket of the prisoner, swore to its being, to the best of his belief, one of the twenty guineas of which he was robbed by the highwayman. * 69

The judge, on summing up the evidence, remarked to the jury, on all the concurring circumstances against the

prisoner; and the jury, on this strong circumstantial evidence, without going out of court, brought in the prisoner guilty.

Jennings was executed, some little time after, at Hull, repeatedly declaring his innocence to the very moment he was turned off.

* 70 Within a twelvemonth after, lo! Brunell, *Jennings's master, was himself taken up for a robbery done on a guest in his own house; and, the fact being proved on his trial, he was convicted, and ordered for execution. The approach of death brought on repentance, and repentance confession. Brunell not only acknowledged the committing of many highway robberies, for some years past, but the very one for which poor Jennings suffered!

The account he gave was, that he arrived at home, by a nearer way and swifter riding, some time before the gentleman got in who had been robbed. That he found a man at home waiting, to whom he owed a little bill, and that, not having quite enough loose money in his pocket, he took out of the purse one guinea, from the twenty he had just got possession of, to make up the sum; which he paid, and the man went his way. Presently came in the robbed gentleman, who, whilst Brunell was gone into the stables, and not knowing of his arrival, told his tale, as before related, in the kitchen. The gentleman had scarcely left the kitchen, before Brunell entered it; and being there informed, amongst other circumstances, of the marked guineas, he was thunderstruck! Having paid one of them away, and not daring to apply for it again, as the
* 71 affair of the robbery and marked *guineas would soon become publicly known,—detection, disgrace, and ruin, appeared inevitable. Turning in his mind every way to escape, the thought of accusing and sacrificing poor Jennings at last struck him. The rest the reader knows.

CASE II.

Girl at Liege.

In the year 1764, a citizen of Liege was found dead in his chamber, shot in the head. Close to him lay a discharged pistol, with which he had apparently been his own executioner. Firearms are the chief manufacture of that city; and so common is the use of pistols at that place, that every peasant, who brings his goods to the markets there, is seen armed with them: so that the circumstance of the pistol did not, at first, meet with so much attention as it might have done in places where those weapons are not in such common use. But, upon the researches of the proper officer of that city, whose duty, like that of our coroner, it is to inquire into all *the circumstances of accidental deaths, it appeared, that the ball, which was found lodged in the head of the deceased, could never, from its size, have been fired out of the pistol which lay by him; thus it was clear that he had been murdered; nor were they long in deciding who was the murderer! A girl, of about sixteen, the niece of the deceased, had been brought up by him, and he had been always supposed to have intended to leave her his effects, which were something considerable; but the girl had then lately listened to the addresses of a young man whom the uncle did not approve of, and he had, upon that occasion, several times threatened to alter his will, and leave his fortune to some other of his relations. Upon these, and some other concurrent circumstances, such as having been heard to wish her uncle's death, &c. the girl was committed to prison. * 72

The torturing a supposed criminal, in order to force confession, is certainly the most cruel and absurd idea that ever entered into the head of a legislator! This being observed by the writer of this narrative, who was then at Liege, to a magistrate of that place, on this very occasion, his defence was,—"We never condemn to the torture but

upon circumstances on which you in England would con-
* 73 vict; so that the innocent *has really a better chance to escape here than with you." But, until it is proved that pain has a greater tendency to make a person speak truth than falsehood, this reasoning seems to have little weight.

This unhappy girl was, therefore, horridly and repeatedly tortured; but still persevering in asserting her innocence, she at last escaped with life;—if it could be called an escape, when it was supposed she would never again enjoy health or limbs, from the effects of the torture.

The writer has since learned, that, some years afterwards, her innocence became manifest, by the confession of the real assassins, who, being sentenced to the wheel for other crimes, confessed themselves the authors of this of which the girl had been suspected; and that, several pistols having been discharged at the deceased, they had, intending that it should appear a suicide, laid a pistol near him, without adverting that it was not the same by which he fell.

---

* 74 *CASE III.

Thomas Harris, who was executed at York, for the Murder of James Gray, in the Year 1642.

Thomas Harris kept the Rising Sun, a public house, about eighteen miles from York, on the road to Newcastle. Harris had a man and maid servant: the man, whose name was Morgan, he kept in the threefold capacity of waiter, hostler, and gardener. James Gray, a blacksmith, travelling on foot to Edinburgh, stopped at Harris's, supped, and lay there. Early in the morning, Morgan went secretly to a neighbouring magistrate, and gave information that his master, Harris, had just then murdered the traveller, James Gray, in his bed. A warrant was issued, and Harris was apprehended. Harris positively denied the charge, and

Morgan as positively affirmed it; deposing, that he saw Harris, on the stranger's bed, strangling him, but that he came too late to save him; and that Harris's plea was, the deceased was in a fit, and he was only assisting him. Morgan further deposed, that he instantly retired, and made a feint as if going down stairs, but creeping up very softly to an adjoining room, he there, through a *key-hole, saw his master rifling the breeches of the deceased. * 75

Harris peremptorily denied every part of this story, from the beginning to the end; and the body having, by order of the magistrate, been inspected, and no mark of violence appearing thereon, Harris was nearly on the point of being discharged, when the maid servant desired also to be sworn. She deposed, that almost directly after her master came down in the morning, as she must conceive, from the traveller's room, she saw him go into the garden, (being, unknown to her master, in a back washhouse which overlooked it,) saw him take some gold out of his pocket, wrap it up in something, and bury it at the foot of a tree, in a private corner of the place.

Harris turned pale at the information! He would give no direct answer as to the circumstance of the money! A constable was despatched with the girl, and the cash, to the amount of upwards of thirty pounds, was found! The accused acknowledged the hiding of that money, but he acknowledged it with so many hesitations, and answered every question with such an unwillingness, such an apparent unopenness, that all doubts of his guilt were now done away, and the magistrate committed him for trial.

*Harris was brought to the bar, at York summer assizes, which happened about a week after his commitment, in 1642. Morgan deposed the same as when before the justice. The maid servant and the constable deposed to the *circumstance* of the money; the first, as to the prisoner's hiding, and both as to the finding of it. And the magistrate gave testimony to the confusion and hesitation of Harris on the discovery of, and being questioned about, the hiding of the money. * 76

Harris, on his defence, endeavoured to invalidate the charge, by assertions, that the whole of Morgan's evidence was false; that the money which he buried was his own property, honestly come by, and buried there for his better security; and that his behaviour before the magistrate, on this particular, arose from the shame of acknowledging his natural covetousness,—not from any consciousness of guilt. The judge then summed up the evidence, remarking strongly on the *circumstance* of the hiding of the money, and the weakness of the prisoner's reasons for his so hiding of it; and the jury, just consulting together for *two minutes*, brought in their verdict—guilty.

Harris was executed pursuant to his sentence, persevering in his declarations of innocence, but desiring all persons to guard against the effects of an avaricious disposition! for it was that sordidness *of temper which had led him, he said, into general distrustfulness, and that into the expedient of hiding his money; which *circumstance* had alone furnished the means to his enemies, (for what reason they were so, he said, he knew not, but whom he forgave,) for bringing him to an ignominious death.

*77

The truth of the fact at last came out: Harris was indeed entirely innocent!

Morgan and the maid were not only fellow servants but sweethearts. Harris's suspecting covetous temper was well known to both, and the girl once, by accident, perceiving her master burying something, discovered the circumstance to Morgan; he, acting as gardener, took an opportunity, when at work, to dig for it; it proved to be five guineas; he left it, and informed the girl of it. They settled it, not to touch the money, but to keep watching their master, as they had no doubt but he would add to it; and, when it arose to a good sum, they agreed to plunder the hiding place together, marry, and, with the spoil, set up in some way of business. As they imagined, so it happened; they got several occasions to see the stock increasing, but (equally covetous with their master,) the golden harvest was not yet ripe!

One day, in a quarrel, Harris strikes his man *Morgan several times. Morgan determines on revenge: at this fatal period arrives James Gray. Morgan finds him, the next morning, dead in his bed. The diabolical thought strikes Morgan, of first charging Harris with the murthering and robbing of Gray, and then of plundering his master's hiding place, whilst he (the master) shall be in prison. Morgan communicates this intention to the maid: she approves of it; they consult and fix on the plan, and Morgan gives the information to the magistrate as before related. The girl, unexpectedly, finds the accusation not sufficiently supported, and fears that her sweetheart, of whom she is fond, will be punished for perjury, if her master is released; who indeed, unfortunately, had just hinted as much before the justice. The expedient, in a moment, strikes her to sacrifice the hidden money, and with it her master, to the safety of her paramour; and the idea, as the reader already knows, fatally succeeds!

The whole of this stupendous piece of wickedness came to light in the beginning of the year 1643, on a quarrel between Morgan and the girl; who, after the death of Harris, had lived together as man and wife.

They were taken up in consequence, and committed to prison, but escaped the public *punishment due to their crime, by both of them dying of a jail disease. * 79

Harris's innocence became afterwards further illustrated, by its being found out that James Gray, the supposed murthered person, had had two attacks of an apoplexy, some months previous to his death, and that he was never master of five pounds at one time in his life.

CASE IV.

James Crow, alias Thomas Geddely, who was executed at York, for a Burglary, in the Year 1727.

Thomas Geddely lived, as a waiter, with Mrs. Hannah Williams, who kept a public house at York. It being a

house of much business, and the mistress very assiduous therein, she was deemed in wealthy circumstances. One morning her scrutoire was found broke open and robbed, and Thomas Geddely disappearing at the same time, there was no doubt left as to the robber. About a twelvemonth
*80 after, a man, *calling himself James Crow, came to York, and worked a few days, for a precarious subsistence, in carrying goods as a porter. By this time he had been seen by many, who accosted him as Thomas Geddely. He declared, he did not know them, that his name was James Crow, and that he never was at York before: this was held as merely a trick, to save himself from the consequences of the robbery committed in the house of Mrs. Williams, when he lived with her as waiter.

His mistress was sent for, and, in the midst of many people, instantly singled him out; called him by his name, (Thomas Geddely,) and charged him with his unfaithfulness and ingratitude in robbing her.

He was directly hurried before a justice of the peace, but, on his examination, absolutely affirmed, that he was not Thomas Geddely, that he knew no such person, that he never was at York before, and that his name was James Crow. Not, however, giving a good account of himself, but rather admitting himself to be a vagabond and petty rogue, and Mrs. Williams and another swearing positively to his person, he was committed to York Castle, for trial at the next assizes.

*81 On arraignment, he pleaded—not guilty, still *denying that he was the person he was taken for; but Mrs. Williams, and some others, swearing that he was the identical Thomas Geddely, who lived with her when she was robbed, and who went off immediately on the commitment of the robbery, and a servant girl deposing that she saw him that very morning, in the room where the scrutoire was broke open, with a poker in his hand, and the prisoner being unable to prove an alibi, he was found guilty of the robbery. He was soon after executed, but persisted, to his latest breath, that he was not Thomas Geddely, and that his name was James Crow.

And so it proved! For, some time after, the true Thomas Geddely, who, on robbing his mistress, had fled from York to Ireland, was taken up in Dublin for a crime of the same stamp, and there condemned and executed. Between his conviction and execution, and again at the fatal tree, he confessed himself to be the very Thomas Geddely who had committed the robbery at York, for which the unfortunate James Crow had been executed.

We must add, that a gentleman, an inhabitant of York, happening to be in Dublin at the time of Geddely's trial and execution, and who knew him when he lived with Mrs. Williams, *declared that the resemblance between the two men was so exceedingly great, that it was next to impossible for the nicest eye to have distinguished their persons asunder. * 82

CASE V.

John Miles, who was executed at Exeter, for the Murder of William Ridley.

William Ridley kept the Red Cow, a public house at Exeter. John Miles was an old acquaintance of Ridley's, but they had not seen each other for some time, (Miles living some distance off,) when they met one morning, as the latter was going a little way to receive some money. They adjourned to the next public house, and, after drinking together, Ridley told Miles that he must go about the business which brought him from home, which was to receive a sum of money, but made him promise to wait for his coming back. Ridley returned, and they drank together again. Ridley now insisted upon Miles's accompanying him home to dinner.—*They dined, they drank, they shook hands, repeated old stories, drank and shook hands again and again, as old acquaintances in the lower class, after long absences, usually do; in fine, they both got, at last, pretty much in liquor. * 83

The room they sat in was backwards, detached as it were from the house, with a door that went immediately into a yard, and had communication with the street, without passing through the house.

As it grew late, Mrs. Ridley at length came into the room, and not seeing her husband there, made inquiry after him of Miles. Miles being much intoxicated, all that could be got out of him was, that Ridley went out into the yard some time before, as he supposed on account of there being no chamber-pot in the room, and had not returned. Ridley was called, Ridley was searched after, by all the family; but neither answering, nor being to be met with, Miles, as well as he was able for intoxication, went his way.

Ridley not coming home that night, and some days passing without his returning, or being heard of, suspicions began to arise, in the mind of Mrs. Ridley, of some foul play against her husband, on the part of Miles; and these
* 84 were not a little increased, on the recollection that *her husband had received a sum of money that day, and that Miles had replied to her inquiries after him, in a very incoherent, unintelligible, broken manner; which, at the time, she had attributed to his being in liquor.

These suspicions went abroad, and at length a full belief took place in many, that Miles was actually the murderer of Ridley; had gone out with him, robbed and murdered him, disposed of the body, and slid back again to the room where they were drinking, unseen by any one.

The officers of justice were sent to take up Miles, and he giving, before the magistrate, a very unsatisfactory relation of his parting with Ridley, which he affirmed was owing to his having been intoxicated when Ridley went out of the room from him, but which the magistrate ascribed to guiltiness; he was committed to Exeter gaol for trial.

Whilst Miles was in confinement, a thousand reports were spread, tending to warp the minds of the people against him. Supernatural as well as natural reasons

were alleged in proof of his guilt. Ridley's house was declared to be haunted! frequent knockings were heard in the dead of the night; two of the lodgers avowed they had seen the ghost! And to crown the whole, an old man, another lodger, positively *affirmed, that once, at mid- * 85
night, his curtains flew open, the ghost of Ridley appeared all bloody! and, with a piteous look and hollow voice, declared he had been murdered, and that Miles was the murderer.

Under these prepossessions amongst the weak and superstitious, and a general prejudice even in the stronger minds, was John Miles brought to trial for the wilful murder of William Ridley. *Circumstances* upon *circumstances* were deposed against him; and as it appeared, that Miles was with Ridley the whole day, both before and after his receiving the money, and that they spent the afternoon and evening together alone, the jury, who were neighbours of Ridley, found Miles guilty, notwithstanding his protestations, on his defence, of innocence; and he was shortly after executed at Exeter.

It happened, that, some time after, Mrs. Ridley left the Red Cow to keep another alehouse, and the person who succeeded her, making several repairs in and about the house, in emptying the necessary, which was at the end of a long dark passage, the body of William Ridley was discovered. In his pockets were found twenty guineas, from whence it was evident he had not been murdered, as the robbing of him was the sole circumstance that could be and was ascribed *to Miles for murdering of Ridley. The * 86
truth of Miles's assertions and defence, now became doubly evident; for it was recollected that the floor of the necessary had been taken up the morning before the death of Ridley, and that, on one side of the seat, a couple of boards had been left up; so that, being much in liquor, he must have fallen into the vault, which was uncommonly deep; but which, unhappily, was not adverted to at the time of his disappearance!

CASE VI.

Two men were seen fighting together in a field. One of them was found, soon after, lying dead in that field. Near him lay a pitchfork which had apparently been the instrument of his death. This pitchfork was known to have belonged to the person who had been seen fighting with the deceased; and he was known to have taken it out with him that morning. Being apprehended and brought to trial, and these circumstances appearing in evidence, and also that there
* 87 had been, for some time, an enmity between *the parties, there was little doubt of the prisoner's being convicted, although he strongly persisted in his innocence; but, to the great surprise of the court, the jury, instead of bringing in an immediate verdict of guilty, withdrew; and, after staying out a considerable time, returned and informed the court, that eleven, out of the twelve, had been, from the first, for finding the prisoner guilty; but that one man would not concur in the verdict. Upon this, the judge observed to the dissentient person, the great strength of the circumstances, and asked him, "how it was possible, *all circumstances considered*, for him to have any doubts of the guilt of the accused?" But no arguments that could be urged, either by the court or the rest of the jury, could persuade him to find the prisoner guilty; so that the rest of the jury were at last obliged to agree to the verdict of acquittal.

This affair remained, for some time, mysterious; but it at length came out, either by the private acknowledgment of the obstinate juryman to the judge who tried the cause, (who is said to have had the curiosity to inquire into the motives of his extraordinary pertinacity,) or by his confession at the point of death, (for the case is related both ways,) that he himself had been the murderer! The ac-
* 88 cused had, indeed, had a *scuffle with the deceased, as sworn on the trial, in which he had dropped his pitchfork, which had been, soon after, found by the juryman, between

whom and the deceased an accidental quarrel had arisen in the same field; the deceased having continued there at work after the departure of the person with whom he had been seen to have the affray; in the heat of which quarrel, the juryman had unfortunately stabbed him with that very pitchfork, and had then got away totally unsuspected: but finding, soon after, that the other person had been apprehended, on suspicion of being the murderer, and fearing, as the circumstances appeared so strong against him, that he should be convicted, although not guilty, he had contrived to get upon the jury, as the only way of saving the innocent, without endangering himself.

---

*CASE VII. * 89

Jonathan Bradford, who was executed at Oxford, for the Murder of Christopher Hayes, Esq. in the Year 1736.

Jonathan Bradford kept an inn, in Oxfordshire, on the London road to Oxford. He bore a very unexceptionable character. Mr. Hayes, a gentleman of fortune, being on his way to Oxford, on a visit to a relation, put up at Bradford's. He there joined company with two gentlemen, with whom he supped, and, in conversation, unguardedly mentioned that he had then about him a sum of money. In due time they retired to their respective chambers; the gentlemen to a two-bedded room, leaving, as is customary with many, a candle burning in the chimney corner. Some hours after they were in bed, one of the gentlemen, being awake, thought he heard a deep groan in an adjoining chamber; and this being repeated, he softly awaked his friend. They listened together, and the groans increasing, as of one dying and in pain, they both instantly arose, and proceeded silently to the door of the next chamber, from whence they had heard the groans, and, the door being a-jar, saw *a light in the room. They * 90

entered, but it is impossible to paint their consternation, on perceiving a person weltering in his blood in the bed, and a man standing over him, with a dark lanthorn in one hand, and a knife in the other! The man seemed as petrified as themselves, but his terror carried with it all the terror of guilt. The gentlemen soon discovered that the murdered person was the stranger with whom they had that night supped, and that the man who was standing over him was their host. They seized Bradford directly, disarmed him of his knife, and charged him with being the murderer. He assumed, by this time, the air of innocence, positively denied the crime, and asserted, that he came there with the same humane intentions as themselves; for that, hearing a noise, which was succeeded by a groaning, he got out of bed, struck a light, armed himself with a knife for his defence, and was but that minute entered the room before them. These assertions were of little avail; he was kept in close custody till the morning, and then taken before a neighbouring justice of the peace. Bradford still denied the murder, but, nevertheless, with such apparent indications of guilt, that the justice hesitated not to make use of this most extraordinary expression, on writing out his mittimus,—"Mr. Bradford, either you or myself committed this murder."

*91 *This extraordinary affair was the conversation of the whole country. Bradford was tried and condemned, over and over again, in every company. In the midst of all this predetermination, came on the assizes at Oxford. Bradford was brought to trial; he pleaded—not guilty. Nothing could be stronger than the evidence of the two gentlemen. They testified to the finding Mr. Hayes murdered in his bed; Bradford at the side of the body with a light and a knife; that knife, and the hand which held it, bloody; that, on their entering the room, he betrayed all the signs of a guilty man; and that, but a few moments preceding, they had heard the groans of the deceased.

Bradford's defence on his trial was the same as before the gentlemen: he had heard a noise; he suspected some

villany was transacting; he struck a light; he snatched the knife, the only weapon near him, to defend himself; and the terrors he discovered, were merely the terrors of humanity, the natural effects of innocence as well as guilt, on beholding such a horrid scene.

This defence, however, could be considered but as weak, contrasted with the several powerful circumstances against him. Never was circumstantial evidence more strong! There was little need of the prejudice of the county against *the murderer to strengthen it; there was little need left of comment from the judge, in summing up of the evidence; no room appeared for extenuation; and the jury brought in the prisoner guilty, even without going out of their box. *92

Bradford was executed shortly after, still declaring that he was not the murderer, nor privy to the murder of Mr. Hayes; but he died disbelieved by all.

Yet were these assertions not untrue! The murder was actually committed by Mr. Hayes's footman: who, immediately on stabbing his master, rifled his breeches of his money, gold watch, and snuff-box, and escaped back to his own room; which could have been, from the after circumstances, scarcely two seconds before Bradford's entering the unfortunate gentleman's chamber. The world owes this knowledge to a remorse of conscience in the footman, (eighteen months after the execution of Bradford,) on a bed of sickness. It was a death-bed repentance, and by that death the law lost its victim.

It is much to be wished that this account could close here, but it cannot! Bradford, though innocent, and not privy to the murder, was nevertheless, the murderer in design: he had heard, as well as the footman, what Mr. Hayes declared at supper, as to the having a sum of money about *him; and he went to the chamber of the deceased, with the same diabolical intentions as the servant. He was struck with amazement! he could not believe his senses! and, in turning back the bed-clothes, to assure himself of the fact, he, in his agitation, dropped his knife *93

on the bleeding body, by which both his hands and the knife became bloody. These circumstances Bradford acknowledged to the clergyman who attended him after his sentence.

CASE VIII.

William Shaw, who was executed at Edinburgh, for the Murder of his Daughter, in the Year 1721.

William Shaw was an upholsterer, at Edinburgh, in the year 1721. He had a daughter, Catherine Shaw, who lived with him. She encouraged the addresses of John Lawson, a jeweller, to whom William Shaw declared the most insuperable objections, alleging him to be a profligate young man, addicted to every kind of dissipation. He
* 94 was forbidden the house; *but the daughter continuing to see him clandestinely, the father, on the discovery, kept her strictly confined.

William Shaw had, for some time, pressed his daughter to receive the addresses of a son of Alexander Robertson, a friend and neighbour; and one evening, being very urgent with her thereon, she peremptorily refused, declaring she preferred death to being young Robertson's wife.

The father grew enraged, and the daughter more positive; so that the most passionate expressions arose on both sides, and the words, "*barbarity*, *cruelty*, and *death*," were frequently pronounced by the daughter! At length he left her, locking the door after him.

The greatest part of the buildings at Edinburgh are formed on the plan of the chambers in our inns of court; so that many families inhabit rooms on the same floor, having all one common staircase. William Shaw dwelt in one of these, and a single partition only divided his apartment from that of James Morrison, a watch-case maker. This man had indistinctly overheard the conversation and

quarrel between Catherine Shaw and her father, but was particularly struck with the repetition of the above words, she having pronounced them loudly and emphatically! For some little time after the father was *gone out, all was silence, but presently Morrison heard several groans from the daughter. Alarmed! he ran to some of his neighbours under the same roof. These, entering Morrison's room, and listening attentively, not only heard the groans, but distinctly heard Catherine Shaw, two or three times, faintly exclaim,—"Cruel father, thou art the cause of my *death!*" Struck with this, they flew to the door of William Shaw's apartment; they knocked,—no answer was given. The knocking was still repeated,—still no answer. Suspicions had before arisen against the father; they were now confirmed: a constable was procured, an entrance forced; Catherine was found weltering in her blood, and the fatal knife by her side! She was alive, but speechless; but, on questioning her as to owing her death to her father, was just able to make a motion with her head, apparently in the affirmative, and expired. * 95

Just at the critical moment, William Shaw returns and enters the room. All eyes are on him! He sees his neighbours and a constable in his apartment, and seems much disordered thereat; but, at the sight of his daughter, he turns pale, trembles, and is ready to sink. The first surprise, and the succeeding horror, leave little doubt of his guilt in the breasts of the beholders; *and even that little is done away, on the constable discovering that the shirt of William Shaw is bloody. * 96

He was instantly hurried before a magistrate, and, upon the depositions of all the parties, committed to prison on suspicion. He was shortly after brought to trial, when, in his defence, he acknowledged the having confined his daughter to prevent her intercourse with Lawson; that he had frequently insisted on her marrying of Robertson; and that he had quarrelled with her on the subject, the evening she was found murdered, as the witness Morrison had deposed: but he averred, that he left his daughter

unarmed and untouched; and that the blood found upon his shirt was there in consequence of his having bled himself some days before, and the bandage becoming untied. These assertions did not weigh a feather with the jury, when opposed to the strong circumstantial evidence of the daughter's expressions, of "barbarity,—cruelty,—death," and of "cruel father, thou art the cause of my death,"—together with that apparently affirmative motion with her head,—and of the blood so seemingly providentially discovered on the father's shirt. On these several concurring circumstances, was William Shaw found guilty, was executed, and was hanged in chains at Leith Walk, in November, 1721.

*97 *Was there a person in Edinburgh who believed the father guiltless? No, not one! notwithstanding his latest words at the gallows were, "I am innocent of my daughter's murder."

But in August, 1722, as a man, who had become the possessor of the late William Shaw's apartments, was rummaging, by chance, in the chamber where Catherine Shaw died, he accidentally perceived a paper, fallen into a cavity on one side of the chimney: It was folded as a letter, which opening, it contained the following:—

"Barbarous Father,

"Your cruelty in having putting it out of my power, ever to join my fate to that of the only man I could love, and tyrannically insisting upon my marrying one whom I always hated, has made me form a resolution to put an end to an existence which is become a burden to me. I doubt not I shall find mercy in another world; for sure no benevolent Being can require that I should any longer live in torment to myself in this! My death I lay to your charge; when you read this, consider yourself as the inhuman wretch that plunged the murderous knife in the bosom of the unhappy

CATHERINE SHAW."

*98 This letter being shown, the hand-writing was *recognised and avowed to be Catherine Shaw's, by many of

her relations and friends. It became the public talk; and the magistracy of Edinburgh, on a scrutiny, being convinced of its authenticity, they ordered the body of William Shaw to be taken from the gibbet, and given to his family for interment; and, as the only reparation to his memory and the honour of his surviving relations, they caused a pair of colours to be waved over his grave, in token of his innocence.

CASE IX.

John Hawkins and George Simpson, who were executed. May, 1721.

[The whole of this case is not given, as not being applicable to our present purpose; but the following extract affords a most remarkable instance of the fallibility of circumstantial evidence.]

John Hawkins and George Simpson were indicted for robbing the mail, on the 16th of April, 1722. Hawkins, in his defence, set up *an *alibi;* to prove which, he called one William Fuller, who deposed, that Hawkins came to his house on Sunday the 15th of April, and lay there that night, and did not go out until the next morning. Being asked by the court, "by what token do you remember that it was the 15th* of April?" He replied, "by a very good token; for he owed me a sum of money for horse hire, and on Tuesday, the 10th of April, he called upon me and paid me in full, and I gave him a receipt; and I very well remember, that he lay at my house the Sunday night following." The receipt was now produced. "April the 10th, 1722. Received of Mr. John Hawkins, the sum of one pound ten shillings, in full of all accounts, per me William Fuller." Upon inspecting the receipt, the court asked Fuller who wrote it; he replied, "Hawkins wrote

* 99

* The robbery was committed about two o'clock on the morning of the 16th.

the body of it, and I signed it." *Court*—" Did you see him write it!" *Fuller*—" Yes." *Court*—" And how long was it after he wrote it, before you signed?" *Fuller*—" I signed it immediately, without going from the table." *Court*—" How many standishes do you keep in the house?" *Fuller*—" Standishes?" *Court*—" Aye, stan-
* 100 dishes; it is a plain *question." *Fuller*—" My Lord, but one; and that is enough for the little writing we have to do." *Court*—" Then you signed the receipt with the same ink that Hawkins wrote the body of it with?" *Fuller*—" For certain." *Court*—" Officer, hand the receipt to the jury. Gentlemen, you will see that the body of the note is written with one kind of ink, and the name at the bottom with another very different; and yet this witness has sworn, that they were both written with the same ink, and one immediately after the other. You will judge what credit is to be given to his evidence!"

Thus the authenticity of the receipt, and the credit of the witness were overthrown by the sagacity of the court! But while the judge, Lord Chief Baron Montague, was summing up the evidence, he was interrupted by the following occurrence: the person who reports the trial, was then taking notes of the proceedings; his ink, as it happened, was very bad, being thick at the bottom, and thin and waterish at the top, so that, accordingly as he dipped the pen, the writing appeared very pale or pretty black. This *circumstance* being remarked by some gentlemen present, they handed the book to the jury: the judge perceiving them very attentively inspecting it, called to them
* 101 —" Gentlemen, what are *you doing? What book is that?" They told him that it was the writer's book, and that they were observing how the same ink appeared pale in one place, and black in another. The judge then told them—" You ought not, gentlemen, to take notice of any thing but what is produced in evidence;" and, turning to the writer, demanded—" What he meant by showing that book to the jury?" And being informed by the writer, that it was taken from him; he inquired " who took it,

and who handed it to the jury?" But this the writer could not say, as the gentlemen near him were all strangers to him, and he had not taken any particular notice of the person who took his book.

That a jury ought not to take notice of any thing but what is produced in evidence, has been said to be law; but, on the contrary, it has been held, and surely very properly, that a juryman may find from his own knowledge; indeed, what evidence can convince a person that *is* which he knows *not* to be?

Hawkins and Simpson were convicted and executed: indeed, the evidence against them was very strong; but, had the fate of Hawkins depended upon the single testimony of Fuller, he would, but for this occurrence, have fallen a sacrifice to the acuteness of the *judge!* who ap-
*pears to have been much displeased at the accidental con- * 102
futation of his remarks on the receipt, although it was an accident in favour of life; and, had it not been in a case where other evidence was so strong against the accused, it must have been looked upon as the special interposition of Providence.

CASE X.

A MAN was tried for and convicted of the murder of his own father. The evidence against him was merely circumstantial, and the principal witness was his sister. She proved that her father possessed a small income, which, with his industry, enabled him to live with comfort; that her brother, the prisoner, who was his heir at law, had long expressed a great desire to come into the possession of his father's effects; and that he had long behaved in a very undutiful manner to him, wishing, as the witness believed, to put a period to his existence by uneasiness and vexation: that, on the evening the murder was commit-

ted, the deceased went a small distance *from the house, to milk a cow he had for some time kept, and that the witness also went out to spend the evening and to sleep, leaving only her brother in the house; that, returning home early in the morning, and finding that her father and brother were absent, she was much alarmed, and sent for some neighbours to consult with them, and to receive advice what should be done; that, in company with these neighbours, she went to the hovel in which her father was accustomed to milk the cow, where they found him murdered in an inhuman manner, his head being almost beat to pieces; that a suspicion immediately falling on her brother, and there being then some snow upon the ground, in which the footsteps of a human being, to and from the hovel, were observed, it was agreed to take one of the brother's shoes, and to measure therewith the impressions in the snow: this was done, and there did not remain a doubt but that the impressions were made with his shoes. Thus confirmed in their suspicions, they then immediately went to the prisoner's room, and after a diligent search, they found a *hammer* in the corner of a private drawer, with several spots of blood upon it, and with a small splinter of bone, and some brains in a crack which they discovered in the handle. The circumstances of finding the deceased and the hammer, as described by the former wit-
*104 ness, *were fully proved by the neighbours whom she had called: and upon this evidence the prisoner was convicted and suffered death, but denied the fact to the last. About four years after, the witness was extremely ill, and understanding that there were no possible hopes of her recovery, she confessed that her father and brother having offended her, she was determined they should both die; and, accordingly, when the former went to milk the cow, she followed him with her brother's hammer, and in his shoes; that she beat out her father's brains with the hammer, and then laid it where it was afterwards found; that she then went from home to give a better colour to this wicked business, and that her brother was perfectly inno-

cent of the crime for which he had suffered. She was immediately taken into custody, but died before she could be brought to trial.

CASE XI.

John Stringer, in the year 1765.

John Stringer was tried at the Lent assizes, held at Kingston, in the county of Surry, in the year 1765, before the late Lord Chief Baron Smythe, *for the murder of his wife, and found guilty. The trial being on the Saturday, he was ordered for execution on the Monday following. The case was thus: Stringer, a man in low circumstances, had brought his wife, who had long been in an ill state of health, from London to Lambeth, for the benefit of the air: here they lived for some time; generally in great harmony; but not without those little quarrels and scuffles, so common with persons in their rank of life. Upon the woman's death, some of the neighbouring females, who had been occasionally witnesses to these little accidental bickerings between the husband and wife, took it in their heads, that he had murdered her, notwithstanding she had never been heard to make the least complaint of her husband during the course of her illness; and the man was brought to trial in consequence*. * 105

* The ladies are, in general, great enemies to the idea of the husband bestowing any correction on the wife, notwithstanding great authorities in the law have held it to be strictly legal so to do. Indeed, a law writer of great authority and antiquity (if we misremember not, it is Bracton,) giveth a very proper caution to husbands on this head: "for," saith he, "although it be lawful for the husband to correct his wife, with a *lawful* weapon, such as a *broomstick*, &c. &c. yet if he makes use of an *un*lawful instrument, such as an *iron bar*, or the *like*, and death ensue, it will be murder." The females of the place where the author resided, are said to have been so little satisfied with this distinction in their favour, that they dragged our ancient sage of the law through the river, and gave him a thorough ducking.

Some trifling evidence being given of the little differences that had arisen between them; and the opinion of a young surgeon, that some appearances on the corpse were somewhat the appearances of a mortification, occasioned by bruises; Stringer, on these slight circumstances was convicted, and left for execution!

Mr. Carsan, a surgeon of great experience in the neighbourhood, (and still living there), had, on the report of the murder, from mere curiosity, examined the body, and was so clear that there were no marks of violence thereon, that he had not the least apprehension of the possibility of Stringer's being convicted: but hearing of the conviction, and confident of the innocence of the unhappy man, and actuated by the love of justice and humanity, he instantly, on the Sunday, waited on, and represented the case to the Archbishop of Canterbury; his grace gave Mr. Carsan a
*107 letter to Baron Smythe; who, convinced, *by his statement of the matter, that himself and the jury had been too precipitate in forming an opinion of the guilt of Stringer, granted an immediate respite; which gave Mr. Carsan an opportunity of laying the whole case before his majesty, and he had the satisfaction of saving an innocent man from an undeserved and ignominious death.

THE END.

71. 2009. 084. 00706